

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126
ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSM-03 SSO-00 PA-01 SS-15 NSCE-00
USIE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 INRE-00 ACDA-12
IO-13 SP-02 /067 R

DRAFTED BY NEA/P:GFSHERMAN:MAR
APPROVED BY NEA:ALATHERTONJR.
S/S-O:JETHYDEN

-----053938 310640Z /10

O 310537Z MAR 78 ZFF6
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV NIACT IMMEDIATE
INFO AMCONSUL JERUSALEM IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY AMMAN IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY CAIRO IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY JIDDA IMMEDIATE
USDEL SECRETARY IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BEIRUT PRIORITY

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

FOR HODDING CARTER

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PEPR, IS

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND BRIEFING TO SEVEN ISRAELI
CORRESPONDENTS
SECRETARY ACKNOWLEDGE ONLY

1. FOLLOWING IS A CLOSE PARAPHRASE OF A ONE-HOUR BACK-
GROUND SESSION WHICH ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON HAD WITH
THE SEVEN ISRAELI CORRESPONDENTS BASED IN WASHINGTON.
AGREED ATTRIBUTION WAS TO BE TO "AN AMERICAN OFFICIAL".
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

AT OUTSET NOTE THAT ATHERTON MADE THE POINT THAT HE WAS
RESPONDING TO THEIR REPEATED REQUESTS FOR A BACKGROUND
BRIEFING, AND THEY RESPONDED ALL HAD AGREED TO NOTE THAT
FACT IN ANY STORIES WRITTEN.

2. BEGIN TEXT:

WE HAVE JUST HAD A SESSION WITH THE PRIME MINISTER HERE IN
WHICH VERY SERIOUS TALKS WERE HELD AND VERY SERIOUS IS-
SUES DISCUSSED. THE PRESIDENT MADE SOME SUGGESTIONS AND

PUT FORTH SOME IDEAS ON WHICH WE HAVE ASKED THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT TO REFLECT, WITH THE VIEW OF TRYING TO MOVE THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS FORWARD. WE FULLY RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS THE NEED FOR TIME FOR THESE DISCUSSIONS TO TAKE PLACE IN ISRAEL AND FOR THESE IDEAS TO BE REFLECTED UPON. AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME WE ASSUME THERE WILL BE A

RESPONSE TO US ON THESE IDEAS IN DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS. I WANT, ABOVE ALL, TO AVOID THE IMPRESSION THAT WE ARE TRYING TO INTERFERE IN OR INFLUENCE OR IN ANY WAY TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION OF PRESSING ON THAT INTERNAL DISCUSSION IN ISRAEL. I AM CONCERNED THAT STORIES COMING OUT OF THIS KIND OF A SESSION MIGHT BE SO INTERPRETED. I WANTED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I AM RESPONDING TO A REQUEST FOR THIS BRIEFING AND NOT TRYING TO PLUG ANY PARTICULAR LINE.

QUESTION: HOW SERIOUS IS THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE U.S. AND ISRAEL RIGHT NOW?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO USE THE WORD CONFRONTATION. I THINK THERE ARE SERIOUS ISSUES ON WHICH WE HAVE SERIOUS DIFFERENCES. TO DISGUISE THAT FACT WOULD NOT DO A LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

SERVICE TO THE OBJECTIVES THAT IN THE LONG RUN WE AND ISRAEL BOTH HAVE IN TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO GET AROUND THE IMPASSES AND OBSTACLES IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE DIFFERENCES ARE ON VERY FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF POLICY.

QUESTION: IS THE U.S. COMING FORWARD WITH ITS OWN IDEAS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT PUT THESE FORWARD AS AN AMERICAN PROPOSAL OR AMERICAN PLAN. SOME IDEAS WERE PUT OUT IN AN EXPLORATORY WAY TO BE DISCUSSED FURTHER BETWEEN US AND ISRAEL. WE HAVE NOT PUT OUT TIMETABLES FOR SETTING FORTH AMERICAN IDEAS OR PROPOSALS. WE DO NOT RULE OUT AT SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE PUTTING FORWARD IDEAS OR PROPOSALS TO BRIDGE THE GAPS, WHEN WE THINK THIS MIGHT BE HELPFUL IN ADVANCING THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS. THIS WOULD NOT OCCUR UNTIL AFTER SERIOUS CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN US AND BOTH ISRAEL AND EGYPT. WE ARE NOW IN THE PROCESS OF CONSULTATION TO TRY TO REACH SOME JUDGMENTS ON WHEN A CONTRIBUTION FROM US WOULD HAVE A CONSTRUCTIVE RESULT.

QUESTION: THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER SEEMED TO DISCUSS, FROM WHAT HAS COME OUT, SPECIFICS WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA--NOT SINAI. IS THIS A PART OF WHAT IS CALLED THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES?

ANSWER: NO, THEY ARE NOT PART OF THE DECLARATION OF

PRINCIPLES. TO ANSWER YOU, I HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE AGENDA OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. THERE WERE THREE ITEMS (1) THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE SETTLEMENT, (2) GUIDELINES FOR NEGOTIATING ISSUES DEALING WITH THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. THE PRINCIPLE FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS SINCE THEN, INCLUDING MY TRIP IN THE AREA AND THE DISCUSSIONS WHEN THE PRIME

MINISTER WAS HERE AND PARTICULARLY THE TALKS BETWEEN THE SECRETARY AND DAYAN, HAVE BEEN ON TRYING TO FIND WAYS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

TO GET AN AGREED DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. YOU CAN'T SEPARATE THE ISSUES OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA FROM THE DECLARATION. THE TWO DEAL WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIANS. WHEN YOU TALK OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES, YOU GET INTO WHAT HAPPENS NEXT, WHAT IS THE FOLLOW-ON WITH REGARD TO WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. IN DISCUSSING THE ISSUES DURING THE PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT IT WAS NOT ARTIFICALLY COMPARTMENTALIZED BETWEEN THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ON ONE HAND AND WEST BANK-GAZA-PALESTINIAN PROBLEMS ON THE OTHER. THEY ARE INTERRELATED AND IT IS NECESSARY TO MOVE BACK AND FORTH FROM ONE TO THE OTHER AS THE DISCUSSIONS GO ON. THE THIRD AGENDA ITEM (3) DEALS WITH THE ELEMENTS OF A PEACE TREATY, THE IDEA BEING THAT THAT WOULD BE A KIND OF MODEL FOR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND OTHER ARAB GOVERNMENTS AFTER IT HAD BEEN AGREED UPON BY ISRAEL AND EGYPT.

QUESTION: SO IN EFFECT ON THE SECOND ITEM OF THE AGENDA, ISRAEL WAS NEGOTIATING WITH EGYPT OVER THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOT YET. I WOULD NOT SAY THERE HAS BEEN ANY DIRECT NEGOTIATION BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL ON THAT QUESTION. I HAVE DISCUSSED WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL, AND TO A CERTAIN EXTENT WITH JORDAN IN MY LAST TRIP TO AMMAN IN A VERY EXPLORATIVE AND TENTATIVE WAY, THIS SECOND AGENDA ITEM. LET'S REMEMBER THERE IS A PROPOSAL ON THE TABLE THAT RELATES TO THAT ITEM. IT IS THE PRIME MINISTER'S SELF-RULE PROPOSAL FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA THAT COMES UNDER THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. IT IS A PROPOSAL FOR THE CHANGE OF STATUS WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, THAT WAS FORMALLY
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

PRESENTED TO EGYPT, TO PRESIDENT SADAT AT ISMAILIA. IT

HAS BEEN WELL PUBLICIZED AND THEREFORE IS THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION IN THE ARAB WORLD. IT HAS ALSO BEEN THE SUBJECT OF SOME DISCUSSION BETWEEN US AND THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT IDEAS THAT WOULD MOVE THE NEGOTIATIONS FORWARD, WE WERE NOT ONLY CONCERNED WITH ELEMENTS OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES DEALING WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION, BUT ALSO WITH WHAT COMES NEXT REGARDING WEST BANK AND GAZA ARRANGEMENTS. SO THE IDEAS WE HAVE SUGGESTED DEAL WITH BOTH OF THESE AREAS AND THEY ALSO DEAL WITH A COUPLE OF THE ISSUES ON SINAI.

QUESTION: DID THESE IDEAS EVOLVE WITH THE EGYPTIANS

AND HAVE THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY ACCEPTED THEM IN PRINCIPLE OR ARE THESE PURELY AMERICAN IDEAS THAT ARE NOW PRESENTED TO BOTH SIDES?

ANSWER: THESE ARE AMERICAN IDEAS THAT IN MANY CASES HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE EGYPTIANS. THEY REPRESENT IDEAS WE THINK MIGHT BECOME REASONABLE COMPROMISES BETWEEN ISRAELI AND EGYPTIAN NEGOTIATORS. THEY HAVE BEEN IN SOME CASES THE SUBJECT OF OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE EGYPTIANS AND INEVITABLY HAVE INVOLVED PRINCIPLES AND INFORMALLY, WEST BANK-GAZA AGREEMENTS. ON MY LAST TRIP I GOT INTO SOME OF THESE WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL. THEY ARE OUR THINKING AT THIS POINT, BUT WE HAVE NOT FORMALIZED THEM. WE ARE STILL FEELING OUR WAY TO TRY TO FIND WAYS THAT THE PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED. WE HAVE PUT THEM FORTH IN THIS SPIRIT.

QUESTION: WHEN THE PRESIDENT READS FROM A LIST OF ASSUMPTIONS AND DESCRIBES SIX ISRAELI POSITIONS THAT ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE, DOESN'T THAT GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT THERE ALREADY IS AN AMERICAN PLAN? THEY GET INTO SUCH LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

A SPECIFICITY THAT IT SEEMS THAT THE AMERICAN PLAN HAS ALREADY BEEN PUT FORWARD?

ANSWER: I DON'T AGREE WITH THAT. CLEARLY, THEY MAY FORESHADOW THE WAY THAT OUR IDEAS ARE TAKING SHAPE IN OUR OWN MINDS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY NOT PUT FORWARD ON A TAKE-IT-OR-LEAVE-IT BASIS. THEY ARE THE BEST JUDGMENT WE CAN MAKE ON WHAT IS GOING TO BE NECESSARY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS IN THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI NEGOTIATIONS. THEY ARE NOT A PLAN. WE HAVE NOT PUT THEM FORWARD AS A PLAN.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE GIVEN THESE IDEAS TO THE ISRAELIS AND ASKED THEM TO MULL THEM OVER.

ANSWER: WE THINK IF THESE WERE ACCEPTABLE TO THE ISRAELIS, IT WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS AND GET THE NEGOTIATIONS GOING AGAIN. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT AT THIS POINT THEY ARE ALREADY ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. IN SEVERAL INSTANCES THEY ARE NOT.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US ANY INSTANCES?

ANSWER: FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE QUESTION OF WITHDRAWAL, EGYPT'S PREFERRED FORMULATION ON THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE INTERPRETED AS A COMMITMENT TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL. WE HAVE ALWAYS DECLINED TO ACCEPT THAT INTERPRETATION OF RESOLUTION 242 AND WE DO NOT THINK THAT YOU ARE GOING

TO GET A PRINCIPLE THAT ISRAEL WOULD AGREE TO, OR WHICH WE WOULD SUPPORT, IF IT REQUIRES A COMMITMENT IN ADVANCE TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL.

QUESTION: ON SINAI TOO?
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

ANSWER: I'M TALKING ABOUT ANY FRONT. SINAI IS ALREADY IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY BECAUSE THE ISRAELI PROPOSAL WHICH WAS GIVEN TO SADAT IS, IN EFFECT, A PROPOSAL WHICH INCLUDES ACCEPTANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER AS THE FINAL BORDER. IN OTHER WORDS, AT THE END OF ALL PHASES OF IMPLEMENTATION (IN THE SINAI), THERE WOULD BE WITHDRAWAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER, ASSUMING THAT THE SECURITY ISSUES OF DEMILITARIZATION, FUTURE OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND SO FORTH WERE WORKED OUT. AT THIS POINT THIS IS REALLY AN ACADEMIC ISSUE. THE REAL PLACE WHERE THE WITHDRAWAL ISSUE FOCUSES IS THE WEST BANK.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE IS HOW YOU FORMULATE THE PALESTINIAN PRINCIPLE IN THE PALESTINIAN-WEST BANK-GAZA QUESTION. THE EGYPTIANS HAVE ALWAYS SAID THEY THINK THERE SHOULD BE SELF-DETERMINATION WITHOUT ANY QUALIFICATIONS. WE PUT FORWARD A FORMULATION WHEN THE PRESIDENT WAS IN ASWAN, THAT SPEAKS OF PARTICIPATION OF THE PALESTINIANS IN DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE--WHICH IS CERTAINLY NOT UNQUALIFIED AND UNLIMITED SELF-DETERMINATION. OUR FORMULATION AT THIS POINT HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY EITHER SIDE.

QUESTION: HOW COME? HAVEN'T THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE ACCEPTED IT?

ANSWER: ALL I'M SAYING IS THE LAST PROPOSAL WE HAVE HAD FROM THE EGYPTIANS IN TEXTUAL FORM DOES NOT ACCEPT THE ASWAN LANGUAGE. I THINK WE HAVE MADE A JUDGMENT THAT PROBABLY IN THE END THIS WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

QUESTION: WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SAID CONTRADICTS THE TWO FAMOUS ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT IN SPEAKING TO BEGIN-- YOU SAY THE EGYPTIANS WANT FULL SELF-DETERMINATION AND FULL WITHDRAWAL; YET THERE ARE TWO ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PUT AGAINST THE SIX BEGIN "NO'S". THAT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 08 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

IS, THE PRESIDENT'S TWO ASSUMPTIONS WERE REPORTED TO BE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATE, WHICH EVERYONE ASSUMES WOULD BE THE OUTCOME IF THERE WERE PURE SELF-DETERMINATION, AND, SECONDLY, THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE TOTAL WITHDRAWAL ON THE WEST BANK?

ANSWER: FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF OUR APPROACH, OF OUR VIEW OF WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE COMPROMISE DECLARA-

TION OF PRINCIPLES--WE THINK IT HAS TO BE BASED ON THESE TWO ASSUMPTIONS. I'M NOT SAYING AT THIS POINT THAT THESE ASSUMPTIONS ARE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT WE THINK THEY SHOULD BE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT AT SUCH TIME WE GET TO THAT POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: IF ISRAEL ACCEPTS THE ASWAN FORMULA AND THE APPLICABILITY OF 242 TO ALL FRONTS, YOU ARE STILL NOT SURE THAT EGYPT AGREES?

ANSWER: WE CAN'T BE SURE UNTIL WE'VE GOTTEN AN EGYPTIAN REACTION. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT IN OUR JUDGMENT THERE IS A VERY GOOD CHANCE THAT EGYPT WILL ACCEPT, BASED UPON OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EGYPTIAN POSITION.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED IT WITH THE EGYPTIANS AND JORDANIANS AFTER THE BEGIN VISIT?

ANSWER: I WAS SPEAKING OF DISCUSSIONS I HAD IN THE AREA BEFORE THE BEGIN VISIT. WE HAVE BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE JORDANIANS AND EGYPTIANS TO GIVE THEM A BRIEFING OF THE DISCUSSIONS DURING THE BEGIN VISITS. WE ALWAYS DO, JUST AS WE DID IN REVERSE WHEN SADAT IS HERE. WE SENT A REPORT ON THIS TO THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT. BUT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 09 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

WE HAVE NOT BEEN IN A NEGOTIATING EXCHANGE WITH THE JORDANIANS OR EGYPTIANS SINCE THE BEGIN VISIT, BECAUSE AT THIS POINT WE ARE WAITING FOR THE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE ISRAELIS AND OURSELVES TO MOVE FORWARD BEYOND WHERE THEY WERE AT THE END OF THE BEGIN VISIT.

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THE WEIZMAN VISIT TO EGYPT?

ANSWER: FIRST OF ALL I THINK IT IS A VERY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT. THE FACT THAT DIRECT TALKS ARE RESUMING IS HOPEFUL, AND IT REFLECTS A FEELING IN BOTH ISRAEL AND EGYPT THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO CAST AROUND NOT TO LET THE PROCESS STARTED AFTER JERUSALEM COMES TO AN END. THE PRIME MINISTER, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, SUGGESTED A RESUMPTION OF TALKS AND THE EGYPTIANS RESPONDED THAT THEY AGREED TO INVITING WEIZMAN TO COME FOR TALKS WITH GAMASY. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO KEEP THIS CHANNEL OPEN.

QUESTION: IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF A SOFTENING IN HUSSEIN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: THE JORDANIANS CONTINUE TO BE IN A WAIT-AND-SEE POSTURE. THEY HAVE NOT INDICATED ANYTHING NEW ABOUT THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD JOINING THE NEGOTIATIONS. OBVIOUSLY,

ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF TRYING TO GET AN AGREED DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES IS TO GET A FRAMEWORK, ON THE BASIS OF WHICH OTHER STATES, INCLUDING JORDAN IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, WILL BE WILLING TO JOIN IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT THERE HAS BEEN NO INDICATION UP TILL NOW FROM JORDAN WHETHER IT WILL. IT IS SIMPLY WAITING TO SEE WHAT COMES OUT OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS BEFORE MAKING A JUDGMENT.

QUESTION: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE EGYPTIAN POSITION ON THE WEST BANK REPRESENT KING HUSSEIN'S POSITION?
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 10 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

ANSWER: I DON'T THINK THE EGYPTIANS CLAIM TO SPEAK FOR KING HUSSEIN. THEY ARE SAYING THEY HAVE INDEPENDENT EGYPTIAN VIEWS ON WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE BASIS FOR KING HUSSEIN'S JUDGMENT OF THIS ISSUE, BUT WHETHER KING HUSSEIN WILL OR WON'T IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE HIS DECISION, NOT THE EGYPTIANS. I DON'T THINK HE IS PRETENDING TO SPEAK FOR HUSSEIN. HE IS SPEAKING FOR EGYPT, IN TERMS OF HIS SENSE OF EGYPT'S RESPONSIBILITY NOT TO IGNORE THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHER ARABS IN A PEACE SETTLEMENT. HE IS MAKING JUDGMENTS THAT HE THINKS WOULD PROVIDE A REASONABLE BASIS. WHETHER OR NOT OTHERS INCLUDING KING HUSSEIN WILL SEE THAT AS A REASONABLE BASIS REMAINS TO BE SEEN.

QUESTION: WHAT GUARANTEES OR SAFEGUARDS CAN YOU GIVE THAT WILL GUARANTEE THAT A PLEBESCITE WILL NOT EVOLVE INTO A PALESTINIAN STATE?

ANSWER: WE RECOGNIZE THIS IS A VERY DEEP CONCERN ON THE

PART OF ISRAEL. THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT DILEMMA SEEMS TO US THAT IT IS INCONCEIVABLE YOU COULD HAVE AN ULTIMATE RESOLUTION OF THE WEST BANK-GAZA ISSUE IN WHICH THERE WAS NO PROVISION FOR THE PEOPLE TO HAVE A VOICE IN DECISIONS AFFECTING THEIR OWN FUTURE, TO BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR CONSENT ON DECISIONS AFFECTING THEM. THIS IS THE DILEMMA. IT IS WHY WE HAVE PUT EMPHASIS IN OUR OWN THINKING ON THE NEED FOR A PROTRACTED INTERIM PERIOD DURING WHICH THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY AND RESOLVE SOME OF THESE CONCERNS ABOUT THE FINAL OUTCOME THROUGH A PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH ISRAEL WILL BE A PARTY. ON THE QUESTION OF HOW YOU STRUCTURE THE ACT BY WHICH THE POPULATION EXPRESSES ITS VIEWS, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 11 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

WE ARE NOT WEDDED TO ANY WORD, WHETHER IT IS "PLEBESCITE" OR "REFERENDUM" OR "RATIFICATION". HOW YOU STRUCTURE THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE POPULATION IS IN ITSELF A SUBJECT FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND ISRAEL WOULD INEVITABLY BE A PARTY TO THOSE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: BUT YOU STILL WANT A REFERENDUM?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO GIVE IT ANY ONE LABEL WHETHER IT'S "REFERENDUM" OR "PLEBESCITE" OR "RATIFICATION". ALL WE ARE SAYING IS THAT SOME WAY HAS TO BE FOUND FOR THE POPULATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ULTIMATE CHOICE THAT IS MADE. AND IT SEEMS TO US THAT IT HAS TO BE DONE BY SOME ACT THAT INVOLVES A VOTE. ANYTHING SHORT OF THAT IS NOT GOING TO BE SEEN AS VALID FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PEOPLE LIVING THERE.

QUESTION: HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFIABLY DEPRIVE THEM OF THE OPTION OF AN INDEPENDENT STATE?

ANSWER: IN LOGIC THERE IS NO GOOD ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. I THINK ONE HAS TO APPROACH IT FROM THE REALITIES, WHICH ARE THAT THE PALESTINIAN ARABS ARE NOT THE ONLY INTERESTED PARTY. THEY CLEARLY HAVE AN INTEREST, BUT SO DOES ISRAEL: ARISING FROM THE FACT THAT IT IS THE PRESENT AUTHORITY IN THAT AREA, SECONDLY, SINCE THE ULTIMATE DISPOSITION OF THIS AREA IS A VALID SECURITY CONCERN OF ISRAEL. JORDAN HAS A ROLE AS THE FORMER ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY. EGYPT, WITH REGARD TO GAZA, FOR THE SAME REASON. THEREFORE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ARGUE THE THEORY OF PURE SELF-DETERMINATION AND AT THE SAME TIME TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHERS THAT HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THERE ISN'T A LOGICAL ANSWER, BUT THERE IS A VERY REAL, PRACTICAL, POLITICAL ANSWER, AND THAT IS WHAT OUR JUDGMENTS ARE BASED ON.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 12 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

QUESTION: WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PLO DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR
INTERIM AGREEMENT?

ANSWER: THAT IS SOMETHING ONLY TIME WILL TELL. I CAN'T
MAKE A PREDICTION ON SOMETHING THAT IS THAT HYPOTHETICAL.
I WOULD MAKE ONLY THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS. THE PLO,
GIVEN ITS PRESENT POSITION AS REFLECTED IN THE CHARTER,
CLEARLY IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE PARTNER IN THE NEGOTIATIONS
OR IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE ULTIMATE OUTCOME, BECAUSE
IT DOES NOT ACCEPT THE GROUND RULES, ONE OF WHICH IS
THE RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO EXIST AS A STATE IN THE AREA.
WHETHER THE PLO OVER FIVE YEARS WILL CHANGE ITS POSITION,
OR WHETHER THERE WILL BE ELEMENTS THAT WILL LEAVE THE PLO
AND ACCEPT THE BASIS OF NEGOTIATIONS AND BECOME ACCEPTABLE
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PALESTINIANS IS SOMETHING ONLY
HISTORY WILL ANSWER. ONE OF THE NECESSARY INGREDIENTS
OF A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF A NEGOTIATION DURING AN
INTERIM PERIOD FOR A FINAL SETTLEMENT HAS GOT TO BE

THE EMERGENCE OF ACCEPTABLE AND RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN
FOR THE PALESTINIANS, WHO WERE WILLING TO ENGAGE IN NEGOTIATIONS
POINTING TOWARDS A PEACE SETTLEMENT THAT ACCEPTS ISRAEL AS A
NEIGHBOR AND AS A SOVEREIGN STATE, WITH WHICH THEY WILL LIVE
IN PEACE. I KEEP COMING BACK TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INTERIM
PERIOD. IT'S A PERIOD DURING WHICH THE DYNAMIC PROCESS WILL
BE SET IN MOTION, HOPEFULLY, IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY.

QUESTION: WHY CAN'T THIS BE LEFT VAGUE, IF IT IS IMPOSSIBLE
TO NAIL IT DOWN. WHY DOES THE U.S. FEEL WE NOW HAVE TO SAY
WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FIVE YEARS?

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 13 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

ANSWER: WE ARE NOT SAYING YOU CAN NAIL DOWN EVERY DETAIL
OF WHAT HAPPENS IN FIVE YEARS. IN FACT WE ARE SAYING THE
CONTRARY, THAT YOU HAVE PUT OFF FOR NOW THE ULTIMATE AND
FINAL DECISIONS. BUT IN ORDER TO GET THE PROCESS OF
NEGOTIATIONS STARTED ON WHAT WILL ULTIMATELY HAPPEN, YOU
HAVE TO START FROM A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED FRAMEWORK. THAT IS
RESOLUTION 242 AS IT HAS BEEN GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD,
INCLUDING THE APPLICATION OF ALL THE PRINCIPLES OF THAT
RESOLUTION TO ALL OF THE FRONTS WHERE TERRITORY WAS
OCCUPIED IN 1967. WITHOUT ACCEPTANCE OF THAT COMMON
STARTING POINT FOR NEGOTIATIONS, WE DON'T THINK YOU ARE
GOING TO GET THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS STARTED. THAT'S

THE POINT. ACCEPTING THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLES, INCLUDING THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO ALL FRONTS, INCLUDING THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, IS NOT THE SAME THING AS A COMMITMENT TO WITHDRAW. WITHDRAWAL DEPENDS ON AGREEMENT ON A LOT OF THINGS WE ARE NOT TRYING TO PREDETERMINE, SUCH AS MODIFICATIONS IN THE BORDER, SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS INCLUDING ISRAEL'S ROLE IN THAT AREA FOR SECURITY PURPOSES, THE KIND OF POLITICAL STRUCTURE THAT MIGHT EMERGE AND THE DECISIONS THAT THAT POLITICAL STRUCTURE MIGHT MAKE WITH REGARD TO ITS FUTURE RELATIONSHIPS WITH ISRAEL AND JORDAN. IF YOU DO NOT ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE THAT IF EVERYTHING CAN BE WORKED OUT THERE WILL BE WITHDRAWAL, THEN YOU DON'T EVEN GET STARTED. YOU DO NOT EVEN HAVE A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED BASIS THAT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED IN THE PAST.

QUESTION: BUT WHY DO YOU HAVE TO INSIST NOW ON A PLEBESCITE OR EVEN SOME FORM OF EXPRESSION FOR THE RESIDENTS ABOUT THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE THEY WANT IN FIVE YEARS?

ANSWER: WELL, IT IS A MATTER OF PRACTICAL JUDGMENT. WHATEVER IT IS THAT EMERGES SEEMS TO US HAS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED. THAT PRINCIPLE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 14 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

AT LEAST HAS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED.

QUESTION: IF THE ISRAELIS WOULD AGREE TO THE PRINCIPLE OF A REVIEW AND STATE THAT THIS REVIEW, WHICH WILL BE THE RESULT OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL, THE PALESTINIANS, EGYPT, AND JORDAN, THAT THEY WILL ALL DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR PERIOD COME UP WITH SOME FORMULA ACCEPTABLE TO ALL THAT WILL GIVE THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE--WHAT WOULD BE WRONG WITH THAT?

ANSWER: PERHAPS THAT WOULD BE ENOUGH, IF YOU COULD GET AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE PARTICIPATION OF THE POPULATION IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THEN ARE YOU SQUEEZING BEGIN ON HOLDING A PLEBESCITE?

ANSWER: HOW ONE ULTIMATELY FORMULATES THE WAY IN WHICH THE PEOPLE PARTICIPATE IS STILL QUITE OPEN TO NEGOTIATION. THAT IS WHY I WAS VERY CAREFUL TO SAY WE WERE NOT WEDDED TO THE WORD PLEBESCITE OR THE WORD REFERENDUM, OR ANY PARTICULAR FORM. IT IS THE CONCEPT YOU HAVE TO FIND SOME WAY TO HAVE THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED MANIFESTED IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: HASN'T THE CONCEPT ALREADY BEEN AGREED BY ISRAEL?

ANSWER: I THINK THE DIFFERENCES HERE IS THAT THE SELF-RULE PLAN DEALS WITH THE FUTURE OF THE STATUS OF THE PEOPLE. WHAT IS NOT COVERED IS THE FUTURE STATUS OF THE TERRITORY. THERE IS AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 15 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

HERE. WE SAY YOU CANNOT TALK ABOUT HOW THE PEOPLE GOVERN THEMSELVES WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE TERRITORY IN WHICH THEY LIVE. THAT IS WHERE YOU GET BACK TO THE PRINCIPLE OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO THE WEST BANK. THAT DEALS WITH THE TERRITORY AS WELL AS WITH THE WAY THE PEOPLE LIVE AND WHAT ROLE THEY HAVE IN RUNNING THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. THAT IS PERHAPS THE KEY DISTINCTION HERE THAT HAS NOT BEEN BRIDGED.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DETECTED ANY SIGN OF A SOFTENING OR WILLINGNESS ON THE PART OF THE ARABS TO ASSIMILATE THE PALESTINIANS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT REALLY TALKED ABOUT THAT. THAT GETS TO THE SOLUTION OF THE REFUGEE PROBLEM. HERE THE ARAB POSITION IS THAT YOU CANNOT SETTLE THE REFUGEE PROBLEM UNTIL YOU SETTLE THE POLITICAL PROBLEM. ONCE THERE IS A SOLUTION TO THE POLITICAL PROBLEM THEN YOU CAN DEAL ALSO WITH THE REFUGEES IN TERMS OF RESETTLEMENT, COMPENSATION, AND ALL THE OTHER OPTIONS THAT ARE ALWAYS DISCUSSED. NO ARAB GOVERNMENT UP TO NOW HAS BEEN WILLING TO ISOLATE THAT REFUGEES PROBLEM FROM THE OVERALL PROBLEM. AS WE PHRASED IT AT ASWAN, SETTLEMENT OF THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM "IN ALL ITS ASPECTS", WHICH MEANS THE REFUGEE ASPECT AND IT ALSO MEANS THE TERRITORIAL ASPECT.

QUESTION: IS IT A FOREGOING CONCLUSION NOW THERE WON'T BE A SEPARATE PEACE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND EGYPT?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO SAY ANYTHING IS FOREGONE. AT THIS POINT THERE IS NO INDICATION OF ANY CHANGE IN PRESIDENT SADAT'S BASIC APPROACH. THAT IS WHY HE ATTACHES SO MUCH IMPORTANCE TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. EGYPT CLEARLY SEES THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE BILATERAL LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 16 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

NEGOTIATIONS IN THE MILITARY COMMITTEE AND MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. PRESIDENT SADAT WANTS TO ESTABLISH A FRAMEWORK FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE. WHETHER OTHERS WILL ACCEPT THAT FRAMEWORK IS AN OPEN QUESTION. IT DEPENDS ON HOW CREDIBLE A FRAMEWORK IT IS. WHAT EGYPT WILL THEN DO ABOUT ITS OWN BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS IS ALSO AN OPEN QUESTION. YOU CAN'T ANSWER YOUR QUESTION WITHOUT GETTING TO THE POINT WHERE THERE IS AGREEMENT ON THE FRAMEWORK--THAT IS THE DECLARATION--AND POSSIBLY SOME UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT COMES AFTER THAT IN TERMS OF THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM, IN TERMS OF AN INTERIM ARRANGEMENT FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA WHICH IS BASED UPON 242 AS IT HAS GENERALLY BEEN INTERPRETED.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU MADE ANY SPECIAL EFFORTS RECENTLY TO ESTABLISH CONTACT WITH THE PALESTINIAN ARABS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOTHING BEYOND THE NORMAL ONES WE HAVE THROUGH OUR DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR REPRESENTATIVES THERE. THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE IN OUR PRACTICES THERE.

QUESTION: WHAT'S THE POINT IN SADAT'S INVITING WEIZMAN TO CAIRO WHEN HE KNOWS BEGIN HAS NOTHING TO PRESENT WHICH IS AT LEAST AS FAR-REACHING AS WHAT PRESIDENT CARTER HAS PRESENTED TO BEGIN AND HE REJECTED?

ANSWER: MY GUESS IS THAT SADAT WILL TALK TO WEIZMAN NOT ABOUT WHAT THE PRESIDENT TALKED ABOUT. RATHER HE WILL TALK ABOUT WHAT HE HAS ALWAYS TALKED ABOUT, AND THAT GOES FURTHER THAN WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAD TO SAY. I DON'T REALLY KNOW. IT WAS PRIME MINISTER BEGIN'S INITIATIVE, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 17 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

NOT OURS. I DON'T KNOW WHY SADAT SHOULD ACCEPT POSITIONS WHICH ARE LESS THAN THE ONES WE THINK ARE THE BASIS FOR COMPROMISE. AND THE POINT IS THAT SADAT HAS NOT ACCEPTED THOSE POSITIONS, EITHER, UP TO THE PRESENT TIME. IF HE DID, THEN THE QUESTION WOULD BE WHETHER THEY COULD BE ACCEPTED, AS UP TO NOW THEY HAVE NOT BEEN, BY THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT.

QUESTION: DO YOU SUSPECT THAT WEIZMAN MAY BE CARRYING PROPOSALS WITH CONCESSIONS WHICH ISRAEL FINDS MORE PREFERABLE TO BE MAKING TO SADAT THAN TO CARTER?

ANSWER: I HAVE NO BASIS OF KNOWING WHETHER YOUR SUSPICION IS CORRECT. TO THE EXTENT THAT THESE THINGS CAN BE WORKED OUT DIRECTLY BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THAT'S FINE WITH US. WE HAVE NO PRIDE OF PLACE. WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF

THIS BECAUSE THERE WEREN'T DISCUSSIONS GOING ON AND WE WERE ASKED TO KEEP THE PROCESS GOING INDIRECTLY. WE HAVE A SELF-LIQUIDATING ROLE. I AM NOT WEDDED TO THIS JOB FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE. REALISTICALLY, I DON'T THINK WE ARE AT THE POINT WHERE THE TWO SIDES CAN DEAL DIRECTLY AND THE UNITED STATES DOESN'T HAVE TO PLAY THE MIDDLEMAN ROLE. THEY NEED SOMEONE TO INTERPRET EACH TO THE OTHER, AND TO HELP FIND WAYS TO BREAK IMPASSES.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US AN AUTHORITATIVE VERSION OF YOUR IDEAS BEING DISCUSSED? FOR INSTANCE, LAST NIGHT MARVIN KALB ON TELEVISION SAID SOMETHING ABOUT THE STRAIGHTENING OF THE BORDER, WIDENING THE NARROW STRIP ALONG THE JORDAN.

ANSWER: WE HAVE PUT FORWARD NO IDEAS ABOUT WHERE THE LINE SHOULD BE DRAWN, OR WHAT MODIFICATIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE. WE HAVE NOT GOTTEN INTO THAT KIND OF SPECIFIC PROPOSAL. I ASSUME YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE WEST BANK. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 18 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

QUESTION: YES.

ANSWER: NO, THAT IS NOT ONE OF THE IDEAS. I WILL SPEAK OF THE GENERAL AREAS THEY DEALT WITH. THEY HAVE TO DO WITH THE NEED TO FIND A FORMULA THAT WILL MAKE UNAMBIGUOUSLY CLEAR THAT RESOLUTION 242 IN ALL ITS PRINCIPLES APPLIES ON ALL FRONTS. ALL THE FORMULAS THAT HAVE BEEN

SUGGESTED LEAVE THAT QUESTION UNCLEAR. OUR FEELING IS WHY NOT JUST SAY IT. WE HAVE ENOUGH AMBIGUITY IN 242 WITHOUT HAVING MORE AMBIGUITY.

SECONDLY, WE HAVE VIEWS CLEARLY ON SETTLEMENTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES, AND WHAT WOULD BE HELPFUL THERE IN NOT CREATING ADDITIONAL IMPEDIMENTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. I CANNOT GET INTO THE DETAILS OF THESE IDEAS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY IN BOTH THESE AREAS.

QUESTION: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

ANSWER: I AM TALKING ABOUT NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY. I HAVE SEEN REPORTS THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR THE DISBANDMENT OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS. THEY ARE NOT CORRECT. WE HAVE RECOGNIZED THAT THE EXISTING SETTLEMENTS ARE THERE, AND THEIR FUTURE IS PART OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS THERE SHOULD BE NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY.

QUESTION: BY NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY, YOU MEAN

NO EXPANSION OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

ANSWER: YES, I USE "NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY" ADVISEDLY.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 19 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

I MEAN IT IS UNDESIRABLE TO HAVE MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY.
THERE SHOULD BE A FREEZE--NO EXPANDING THEM, NO ENLARGING
THEM.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE NOT INDICATED THAT AT THE END OF
THE PROCESS ISRAEL WOULD HAVE TO ABANDON THE SETTLEMENTS
IN THE RAFAH SALIENT?

ANSWER: WE HAVE SAID THAT A FUTURE SOLUTION TO THEM
HAS TO BE FOUND IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. WE HAVE TALKED IN
TERMS OF WHETHER THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO ISRAELI
DEFENSE FORCES PROTECTING THE SETTLEMENTS. WE ARE NOT
SAYING THAT SADAT WILL ACCEPT THE SETTLEMENTS THERE IF
THEY ARE UNDER UN OR EGYPTIAN PROTECTION. ALL WE ARE
SAYING IS THAT IF THE ELEMENT OF ISRAELI DEFENSE FORCES
THERE PROTECTING THEM WERE REMOVED, THIS MIGHT OPEN
POSSIBILITIES NOT THERE NOW. THE ISRAELI POSITION AS I
UNDERSTAND IT IS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD REMAIN
AND THEY SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY ISRAELI SECURITY FORCES
IN SOME WAY. WE ARE ASKING THE QUESTION ABOUT ALTER-
NATIVE MEANS OF PROTECTION--I DON'T KNOW IF IT WOULD
OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES.

QUESTION: SO YOU ARE SAYING SECRETARY VANCE'S STATEMENT
THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT EXIST DID NOT MEAN THAT

ISRAEL SHOULD NECESSARILY DISMANTLE THEM?

ANSWER: THAT'S RIGHT. WHAT THAT FORMULATION REALLY
MEANT WAS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN
ESTABLISHED.

QUESTION: WHY SHOULD ISRAEL TRUST YOU, TRUST YOUR
SECURITY COMMITMENTS OR GUARANTEES, WHEN IT IS OBVIOUS
THAT YOU ARE NOT KEEPING UP YOUR COMMITMENT TO US ABOUT
THE PLANES? YOU ARE WEDDING THAT COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 20 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

FO 1975 TO OTHER COMMITMENTS TO THE ARABS, AND PUTTING
FORWARD THE PLANES IN A PACKAGE.

ANSWER: GO BACK AND REVIEW THAT COMMITMENT. IT WAS THAT
WE WOULD TAKE STEPS TO ASSURE THE MAINTENANCE OF

ISRAEL'S DEFENSIVE CAPABILITIES THROUGH THE PROVISION OF ADVANCED WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE F-16. SINCE THEN THERE HAVE BEEN A GREAT MANY THINGS APPROVED--F-15S FOR EXAMPLE, AND A LOT OF OTHER EQUIPMENT. I THINK WE ARE MAINTAINING OUR COMMITMENT.

QUESTION: BUT NOW YOU ARE INTRODUCING A NEW ELEMENT; YOU ARE CONDITIONING THE PLANES ON SOMETHING THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH US. SO IF WE GET ANOTHER SECURITY COMMITMENT FROM YOU, A FEW YEARS FROM NOW WE WILL FIND WE ARE DEPENDENT UPON SOME EXTRANEIOUS CNDITION YOU MAKE.

ANSWER: BUT WE ARE PROPOSING TO SELL YOU THE F-16S. WE ARE NOT PROPOSING NOT TO SELL THEM. WE SIMPLY THINK THAT THERE ARE SOME OTHER COMMITMENTS ALSO, INCLUDING A COMMITMENT THAT WAS MADE ALMOST THAT LONG AGO TO SELL A MODERN AIRCRAFT TO THE SAUDIS.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THE LINKAGE?

ANSWER: THE ANSWER IS THAT WE FEEL THAT THIS IS NOT IN VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT OF THE COMMITMENT, THAT WE ARE PROPOSING TO MAKE THE SALE. WE ALSO THINK THE OTHERS ARE VERY IMPORTANT FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW.

QUESTION: BUT THIS HAS RAISED QUESTIONS IN ISRAEL ABOUT THE RELIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES AS A PARTNER IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS?
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 21 STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

ANSWER: I FIND IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW THERE CAN BE ANY REAL QUESTION ABOUT OUR COMMITMENT TO THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL, GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND THE VOLUME OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT THAT HAS BEEN SOLD AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE SOLD. IT SEEMS TO ME THIS

COMMITMENT HAS BEEN SO AMPTLY DEMONSTRATED OVER THE YEARS THAT THERE OUGHT NOT TO BE ANY QUESTION ABOUT IT. I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION. WE SIMPLY DO NOT AGREE THAT SELLING THOSE PLANES TO SAUDI ARABIA IS PROBLEM FOR THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: BUT WASN'T THE LINKAGE MADE TO MAKE THE SALE OF THE SAUDI AND EGYPTIAN PLANES MORE PALATABLE TO CONGRESS?

ANSWER: IT WAS DONE BECAUSE WE THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL OF THESE SALES GO THROUGH FOR THE SAKE OF OUR OWN POLICIES AND OUR OWN INTERESTS IN THE AREA; WE DO NOT THINK IT WILL CHANGE THE BALANCE. I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS WOULD BE KEPT IN PROPORTION, AND NOT SINGLED OUT

TO SHOW THAT THE UNITED STATES IS NOT A RELIABLE PARTNER
OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT DAYAN IS COMING?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NO DEFINITE PROPOSAL. OF COURSE, WE
WILL BE TALKING OVER THE COMING WEEKS, BUT NOTHING IS
DEFINITE YET. COOPER

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 STATE 083012
ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /011 R

66011
DRAFTED BY:NEA/RA:JVMONTVILLE:RA
APPROVED BY:NEA/RA:SEPALMER JR
-----078293 020458Z /21

R 011035Z APR 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY LONDON
USMISSION USNATO

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012

LONDON FOR KINSOLVING

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126 SENT ACTION
TEL AVIV INFO JERUSALEM AMMAN DAMASCUS CAIRO JIDDA USDEL
SECRETARY BEIRUT MAR 31.
QUOTE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

FOR HODDING CARTER

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PEPR, IS

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND BRIEFING TO SEVEN ISRAELI
CORRESPONDENTS
SECRETARY ACKNOWLEDGE ONLY

1. FOLLOWING IS A CLOSE PARAPHRASE OF A ONE-HOUR BACK-
GROUND SESSION WHICH ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON HAD WITH
THE SEVEN ISRAELI CORRESPONDENTS BASED IN WASHINGTON.
AGREED ATTRIBUTION WAS TO BE TO "AN AMERICAN OFFICIAL".
AT OUTSET NOTE THAT ATHERTON MADE THE POINT THAT HE WAS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 083012

RESPONDING TO THEIR REPEATED REQUESTS FOR A BACKGROUND BRIEFING, AND THEY RESPONDED ALL HAD AGREED TO NOTE THAT FACT IN ANY STORIES WRITTEN.

2. BEGIN TEXT:

WE HAVE JUST HAD A SESSION WITH THE PRIME MINISTER HERE IN WHICH VERY SERIOUS TALKS WERE HELD AND VERY SERIOUS ISSUES DISCUSSED. THE PRESIDENT MADE SOME SUGGESTIONS AND PUT FORTH SOME IDEAS ON WHICH WE HAVE ASKED THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT TO REFLECT, WITH THE VIEW OF TRYING TO MOVE THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS FORWARD. WE FULLY RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS THE NEED FOR TIME FOR THESE DISCUSSIONS TO TAKE PLACE IN ISRAEL AND FOR THESE IDEAS TO BE REFLECTED UPON. AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME WE ASSUME THERE WILL BE A

RESPONSE TO US ON THESE IDEAS IN DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS. I WANT, ABOVE ALL, TO AVOID THE IMPRESSION THAT WE ARE TRYING TO INTERFERE IN OR INFLUENCE OR IN ANY WAY TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION OF PRESSING ON THAT INTERNAL DISCUSSION IN ISRAEL. I AM CONCERNED THAT STORIES COMING OUT OF THIS KIND OF A SESSION MIGHT BE SO INTERPRETED. I WANTED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I AM RESPONDING TO A REQUEST FOR THIS BRIEFING AND NOT TRYING TO PLUG ANY PARTICULAR LINE.

QUESTION: HOW SERIOUS IS THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE U.S. AND ISRAEL RIGHT NOW?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO USE THE WORD CONFRONTATION. I THINK THERE ARE SERIOUS ISSUES ON WHICH WE HAVE SERIOUS DIFFERENCES. TO DISGUISE THAT FACT WOULD NOT DO A SERVICE TO THE OBJECTIVES THAT IN THE LONG RUN WE AND LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 083012

ISRAEL BOTH HAVE IN TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO GET AROUND THE IMPASSES AND OBSTACLES IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE DIFFERENCES ARE ON VERY FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF POLICY.

QUESTION: IS THE U.S. COMING FORWARD WITH ITS OWN IDEAS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT PUT THESE FORWARD AS AN AMERICAN PROPOSAL OR AMERICAN PLAN. SOME IDEAS WERE PUT OUT IN AN EXPLORATORY WAY TO BE DISCUSSED FURTHER BETWEEN US AND ISRAEL. WE HAVE NOT PUT OUT TIMETABLES FOR SETTING FORTH AMERICAN IDEAS OR PROPOSALS. WE DO NOT RULE OUT AT SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE PUTTING FORWARD IDEAS OR PROPOSALS TO BRIDGE THE GAPS, WHEN WE THINK THIS MIGHT BE HELPFUL IN ADVANCING THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS. THIS WOULD NOT OCCUR UNTIL AFTER SERIOUS CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN

US AND BOTH ISRAEL AND EGYPT. WE ARE NOW IN THE PROCESS OF CONSULTATION TO TRY TO REACH SOME JUDGMENTS ON WHEN A CONTRIBUTION FROM US WOULD HAVE A CONSTRUCTIVE RESULT.

QUESTION: THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER SEEMED TO DISCUSS, FROM WHAT HAS COME OUT, SPECIFICS WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA--NOT SINAI. IS THIS A PART OF WHAT IS CALLED THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES?

ANSWER: NO, THEY ARE NOT PART OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. TO ANSWER YOU, I HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE AGENDA OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. THERE WERE THREE ITEMS (1) THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE SETTLEMENT, (2) GUIDELINES FOR NEGOTIATING ISSUES DEALING WITH THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. THE PRINCIPLE FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS SINCE THEN, INCLUDING MY TRIP IN THE AREA AND THE DISCUSSIONS WHEN THE PRIME

MINISTER WAS HERE AND PARTICULARLY THE TALKS BETWEEN THE SECRETARY AND DAYAN, HAVE BEEN ON TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO GET AN AGREED DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. YOU CAN'T LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 083012

SEPARATE THE ISSUES OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA FROM THE DECLARATION. THE TWO DEAL WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIANS. WHEN YOU TALK OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES, YOU GET INTO WHAT HAPPENS NEXT, WHAT IS THE FOLLOW-ON WITH REGARD TO WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. IN DISCUSSING THE ISSUES DURING THE PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT IT WAS NOT ARTIFICALLY COMPARTMENTALIZED BETWEEN THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ON ONE HAND AND WEST BANK-GAZA-PALESTINIAN PROBLEMS ON THE OTHER. THEY ARE INTERRELATED AND IT IS NECESSARY TO MOVE BACK AND FORTH FROM ONE TO THE OTHER AS THE DISCUSSIONS GO ON. THE THIRD AGENDA ITEM (3) DEALS WITH THE ELEMENTS OF A PEACE TREATY, THE IDEA BEING THAT THAT WOULD BE A KIND OF MODEL FOR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND OTHER ARAB GOVERNMENTS AFTER IT HAD BEEN AGREED UPON BY ISRAEL AND EGYPT.

QUESTION: SO IN EFFECT ON THE SECOND ITEM OF THE AGENDA, ISRAEL WAS NEGOTIATING WITH EGYPT OVER THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOT YET. I WOULD NOT SAY THERE HAS BEEN ANY DIRECT NEGOTIATION BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL ON THAT QUESTION. I HAVE DISCUSSED WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL, AND TO A CERTAIN EXTENT WITH JORDAN IN MY LAST TRIP TO AMMAN IN A VERY EXPLORATIVE AND TENTATIVE WAY, THIS SECOND AGENDA ITEM. LET'S REMEMBER THERE IS A PROPOSAL ON THE TABLE THAT RELATES TO THAT ITEM. IT IS THE PRIME

MINISTER'S SELF-RULE PROPOSAL FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA
THAT COMES UNDER THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM OF THE POLITICAL
COMMITTEE. IT IS A PROPOSAL FOR THE CHANGE OF STATUS
WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, THAT WAS FORMALLY
PRESENTED TO EGYPT, TO PRESIDENT SADAT AT ISMAILIA. IT
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 083012

HAS BEEN WELL PUBLICIZED AND THEREFORE IS THE SUBJECT
OF DISCUSSION IN THE ARAB WORLD. IT HAS ALSO BEEN THE
SUBJECT OF SOME DISCUSSION BETWEEN US AND THE ISRAELI
GOVERNMENT. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT IDEAS THAT WOULD MOVE
THE NEGOTIATIONS FORWARD, WE WERE NOT ONLY CONCERNED
WITH ELEMENTS OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES DEALING
WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION, BUT ALSO
WITH WHAT COMES NEXT REGARDING WEST BANK AND GAZA AR-
RANGEMENTS. SO THE IDEAS WE HAVE SUGGESTED DEAL WITH
BOTH OF THESE AREAS AND THEY ALSO DEAL WITH A COUPLE
OF THE ISSUES ON SINAI.

QUESTION: DID THESE IDEAS EVOLVE WITH THE EGYPTIANS

AND HAVE THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY ACCEPTED THEM IN PRINCIPLE
OR ARE THESE PURELY AMERICAN IDEAS THAT ARE NOW PRESENTED
TO BOTH SIDES?

ANSWER: THESE ARE AMERICAN IDEAS THAT IN MANY CASES HAVE
NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE EGYPTIANS. THEY REPRESENT IDEAS
WE THINK MIGHT BECOME REASONABLE COMPROMISES BETWEEN
ISRAELI AND EGYPTIAN NEGOTIATORS. THEY HAVE BEEN IN SOME
CASES THE SUBJECT OF OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE EGYPTIANS
AND INEVITABLY HAVE INVOLVED PRINCIPLES AND INFORMALLY,
WEST BANK-GAZA AGREEMENTS. ON MY LAST TRIP I GOT INTO
SOME OF THESE WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL. THEY ARE OUR
THINKING AT THIS POINT, BUT WE HAVE NOT FORMALIZED THEM.
WE ARE STILL FEELING OUR WAY TO TRY TO FIND WAYS THAT THE
PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED. WE HAVE PUT THEM FORTH IN THIS
SPIRIT.

QUESTION: WHEN THE PRESIDENT READS FROM A LIST OF AS-
SUMPTIONS AND DESCRIBES SIX ISRAELI POSITIONS THAT ARE
NOT ACCEPTABLE, DOESN'T THAT GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT
THERE ALREADY IS AN AMERICAN PLAN? THEY GET INTO SUCH
A SPECIFICITY THAT IT SEEMS THAT THE AMERICAN PLAN HAS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 083012

ALREADY BEEN PUT FORWARD?

ANSWER: I DON'T AGREE WITH THAT. CLEARLY, THEY MAY

FORESHADOW THE WAY THAT OUR IDEAS ARE TAKING SHAPE IN OUR OWN MINDS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY NOT PUT FORWARD ON A TAKE-IT-OR-LEAVE-IT BASIS. THEY ARE THE BEST JUDGMENT WE CAN MAKE ON WHAT IS GOING TO BE NECESSARY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS IN THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI NEGOTIATIONS. THEY ARE NOT A PLAN. WE HAVE NOT PUT THEM FORWARD AS A PLAN.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE GIVEN THESE IDEAS TO THE ISRAELIS AND ASKED THEM TO MULL THEM OVER.

ANSWER: WE THINK IF THESE WERE ACCEPTABLE TO THE ISRAELIS, IT WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS AND GET THE NEGOTIATIONS GOING AGAIN. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT AT THIS POINT THEY ARE ALREADY ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. IN SEVERAL INSTANCES THEY ARE NOT.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US ANY INSTANCES?

ANSWER: FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE QUESTION OF WITHDRAWAL, EGYPT'S PREFERRED FORMULATION ON THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE INTERPRETED AS A COMMITMENT TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL. WE HAVE ALWAYS DECLINED TO ACCEPT THAT INTERPRETATION OF RESOLUTION 242 AND WE DO NOT THINK THAT YOU ARE GOING

TO GET A PRINCIPLE THAT ISRAEL WOULD AGREE TO, OR WHICH WE WOULD SUPPORT, IF IT REQUIRES A COMMITMENT IN ADVANCE TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL.

QUESTION: ON SINAI TOO?

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 083012

ANSWER: I'M TALKING ABOUT ANY FRONT. SINAI IS ALREADY IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY BECAUSE THE ISRAELI PROPOSAL WHICH WAS GIVEN TO SADAT IS, IN EFFECT, A PROPOSAL WHICH INCLUDES ACCEPTANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER AS THE FINAL BORDER. IN OTHER WORDS, AT THE END OF ALL PHASES OF IMPLEMENTATION (IN THE SINAI), THERE WOULD BE WITHDRAWAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER, ASSUMING THAT THE SECURITY ISSUES OF DEMILITARIZATION, FUTURE OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND SO FORTH WERE WORKED OUT. AT THIS POINT THIS IS REALLY AN ACADEMIC ISSUE. THE REAL PLACE WHERE THE WITHDRAWAL ISSUE FOCUSES IS THE WEST BANK.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE IS HOW YOU FORMULATE THE PALESTINIAN PRINCIPLE IN THE PALESTINIAN-WEST BANK-GAZA QUESTION. THE EGYPTIANS HAVE ALWAYS SAID THEY THINK THERE SHOULD BE SELF-DETERMINATION WITHOUT ANY QUALIFICATIONS. WE PUT FORWARD A FORMULATION WHEN THE PRESIDENT WAS IN ASWAN, THAT SPEAKS OF PARTICIPATION OF THE PALESTINIANS IN DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE--WHICH IS CERTAINLY NOT UNQUALI-

FIED AND UNLIMITED SELF-DETERMINATION. OUR FORMULATION AT THIS POINT HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY EITHER SIDE.

QUESTION: HOW COME? HAVEN'T THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE ACCEPTED IT?

ANSWER: ALL I'M SAYING IS THE LAST PROPOSAL WE HAVE HAD FROM THE EGYPTIANS IN TEXTUAL FORM DOES NOT ACCEPT THE ASWAN LANGUAGE. I THINK WE HAVE MADE A JUDGMENT THAT PROBABLY IN THE END THIS WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

QUESTION: WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SAID CONTRADICTS THE TWO FAMOUS ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT IN SPEAKING TO BEGIN-- YOU SAY THE EGYPTIANS WANT FULL SELF-DETERMINATION AND FULL WITHDRAWAL; YET THERE ARE TWO ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PUT AGAINST THE SIX BEGIN "NO'S". THAT IS, THE PRESIDENT'S TWO ASSUMPTIONS WERE REPORTED TO BE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 08 STATE 083012

THAT THERE WOULD BE NO INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATE, WHICH EVERYONE ASSUMES WOULD BE THE OUTCOME IF THERE WERE PURE SELF-DETERMINATION, AND, SECONDLY, THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE TOTAL WITHDRAWAL ON THE WEST BANK?

ANSWER: FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF OUR APPROACH, OF OUR VIEW OF WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE COMPROMISE DECLARA-

TION OF PRINCIPLES--WE THINK IT HAS TO BE BASED ON THESE TWO ASSUMPTIONS. I'M NOT SAYING AT THIS POINT THAT THESE ASSUMPTIONS ARE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT WE THINK THEY SHOULD BE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT AT SUCH TIME WE GET TO THAT POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: IF ISRAEL ACCEPTS THE ASWAN FORMULA AND THE APPLICABILITY OF 242 TO ALL FRONTS, YOU ARE STILL NOT SURE THAT EGYPT AGREES?

ANSWER: WE CAN'T BE SURE UNTIL WE'VE GOTTEN AN EGYPTIAN REACTION. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT IN OUR JUDGMENT THERE IS A VERY GOOD CHANCE THAT EGYPT WILL ACCEPT, BASED UPON OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EGYPTIAN POSITION.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED IT WITH THE EGYPTIANS AND JORDANIANS AFTER THE BEGIN VISIT?

ANSWER: I WAS SPEAKING OF DISCUSSIONS I HAD IN THE AREA BEFORE THE BEGIN VISIT. WE HAVE BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE JORDANIANS AND EGYPTIANS TO GIVE THEM A BRIEFING OF THE DISCUSSIONS DURING THE BEGIN VISITS. WE ALWAYS DO, JUST AS WE DID IN REVERSE WHEN SADAT IS HERE. WE SENT A REPORT ON THIS TO THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT. BUT

WE HAVE NOT BEEN IN A NEGOTIATING EXCHANGE WITH THE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 09 STATE 083012

JORDANIANS OR EGYPTIANS SINCE THE BEGIN VISIT, BECAUSE
AT THIS POINT WE ARE WAITING FOR THE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN
THE ISRAELIS AND OURSELVES TO MOVE FORWARD BEYOND WHERE
THEY WERE AT THE END OF THE BEGIN VISIT.

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THE WEIZMAN VISIT TO
EGYPT?

ANSWER: FIRST OF ALL I THINK IT IS A VERY POSITIVE
DEVELOPMENT. THE FACT THAT DIRECT TALKS ARE RESUMING
IS HOPEFUL, AND IT REFLECTS A FEELING IN BOTH ISRAEL
AND EGYPT THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO CAST AROUND NOT TO
LET THE PROCESS STARTED
AFTER JERUSALEM COMES TO AN
END.

THE PRIME MINISTER, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, SUGGESTED A
RESUMPTION OF TALKS AND THE EGYPTIANS RESPONDED THAT
THEY AGREED TO INVITING WEIZMAN TO COME FOR TALKS WITH
GAMASY. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO KEEP THIS CHANNEL OPEN.

QUESTION: IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF A SOFTENING IN
HUSSEIN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: THE JORDANIANS CONTINUE TO BE IN A WAIT-AND-SEE
POSTURE. THEY HAVE NOT INDICATED ANYTHING NEW ABOUT
THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD JOINING THE NEGOTIATIONS. OBVIOUSLY,

ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF TRYING TO GET AN AGREED DECLARA-
TION OF PRINCIPLES IS TO GET A FRAMEWORK, ON THE BASIS
OF WHICH OTHER STATES, INCLUDING JORDAN IN THE FIRST
INSTANCE, WILL BE WILLING TO JOIN IN THE NEGOTIATIONS,
BUT THERE HAS BEEN NO INDICATION UP TILL NOW FROM JORDAN
WHETHER IT WILL. IT IS SIMPLY WAITING TO SEE WHAT COMES
OUT OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS BEFORE MAKING A JUDGMENT.

QUESTION: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE EGYPTIAN POSITION ON
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 10 STATE 083012

THE WEST BANK REPRESENT KING HUSSEIN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: I DON'T THINK THE EGYPTIANS CLAIM TO SPEAK FOR
KING HUSSEIN. THEY ARE SAYING THEY HAVE INDEPENDENT
EGYPTIAN VIEWS ON WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE BASIS FOR
KING HUSSEIN'S JUDGMENT OF THIS ISSUE, BUT WHETHER KING
HUSSEIN WILL OR WON'T IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE HIS DECI-

SION, NOT THE EGYPTIANS. I DON'T THINK HE IS PRETENDING TO SPEAK FOR HUSSEIN. HE IS SPEAKING FOR EGYPT, IN TERMS OF HIS SENSE OF EGYPT'S RESPONSIBILITY NOT TO IGNORE THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHER ARABS IN A PEACE SETTLEMENT. HE IS MAKING JUDGMENTS THAT HE THINKS WOULD PROVIDE A REASONABLE BASIS. WHETHER OR NOT OTHERS INCLUDING KING HUSSEIN WILL SEE THAT AS A REASONABLE BASIS REMAINS TO BE SEEN.

QUESTION: WHAT GUARANTEES OR SAFEGUARDS CAN YOU GIVE THAT WILL GUARANTEE THAT A PLEBESCITE WILL NOT EVOLVE INTO A PALESTINIAN STATE?

ANSWER: WE RECOGNIZE THIS IS A VERY DEEP CONCERN ON THE PART OF ISRAEL. THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT DILEMMA SEEMS TO US THAT IT IS INCONCEIVABLE YOU COULD HAVE AN ULTIMATE RESOLUTION OF THE WEST BANK-GAZA ISSUE IN WHICH THERE WAS NO PROVISION FOR THE PEOPLE TO HAVE A VOICE IN DECISIONS AFFECTING THEIR OWN FUTURE, TO BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR CONSENT ON DECISIONS AFFECTING THEM. THIS IS THE DILEMMA. IT IS WHY WE HAVE PUT EMPHASIS IN OUR OWN THINKING ON THE NEED FOR A PROTRACTED INTERIM PERIOD DURING WHICH THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY AND RESOLVE SOME OF THESE CONCERNS ABOUT THE FINAL OUTCOME THROUGH A PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH ISRAEL WILL BE A PARTY. ON THE QUESTION OF HOW YOU STRUCTURE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 11 STATE 083012

THE ACT BY WHICH THE POPULATION EXPRESSES ITS VIEWS, WE ARE NOT WEDDED TO ANY WORD, WHETHER IT IS "PLEBESCITE" OR "REFERENDUM" OR "RATIFICATION". HOW YOU STRUCTURE THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE POPULATION IS IN ITSELF A SUBJECT FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND ISRAEL WOULD INEVITABLY BE A PARTY TO THOSE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: BUT YOU STILL WANT A REFERENDUM?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO GIVE IT ANY ONE LABEL WHETHER IT'S "REFERENDUM" OR "PLEBESCITE" OR "RATIFICATION". ALL WE ARE SAYING IS THAT SOME WAY HAS TO BE FOUND FOR THE POPULATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ULTIMATE CHOICE THAT IS MADE. AND IT SEEMS TO US THAT IT HAS TO BE DONE BY SOME ACT THAT INVOLVES A VOTE. ANYTHING SHORT OF THAT IS NOT GOING TO BE SEEN AS VALID FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PEOPLE LIVING THERE.

QUESTION: HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFIABLY DEPRIVE THEM OF THE OPTION OF AN INDEPENDENT STATE?

ANSWER: IN LOGIC THERE IS NO GOOD ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. I THINK ONE HAS TO APPROACH IT FROM THE REALITIES,

WHICH ARE THAT THE PALESTINIAN ARABS ARE NOT THE ONLY INTERESTED PARTY. THEY CLEARLY HAVE AN INTEREST, BUT SO DOES ISRAEL: ARISING FROM THE FACT THAT IT IS THE PRESENT AUTHORITY IN THAT AREA, SECONDLY, SINCE THE ULTIMATE DISPOSITION OF THIS AREA IS A VALID SECURITY CONCERN OF ISRAEL. JORDAN HAS A ROLE AS THE FORMER ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY. EGYPT, WITH REGARD TO GAZA, FOR THE SAME REASON. THEREFORE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ARGUE THE THEORY OF PURE SELF-DETERMINATION AND AT THE SAME TIME TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHERS THAT HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THERE ISN'T A LOGICAL ANSWER, BUT THERE IS A VERY REAL, PRACTICAL, POLITICAL ANSWER, AND THAT IS WHAT OUR JUDGMENTS ARE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 12 STATE 083012

BASED ON.

QUESTION: WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PLO DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR INTERIM AGREEMENT?

ANSWER: THAT IS SOMETHING ONLY TIME WILL TELL. I CAN'T MAKE A PREDICTION ON SOMETHING THAT IS THAT HYPOTHETICAL. I WOULD MAKE ONLY THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS. THE PLO, GIVEN ITS PRESENT POSITION AS REFLECTED IN THE CHARTER, CLEARLY IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE PARTNER IN THE NEGOTIATIONS OR IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE ULTIMATE OUTCOME, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ACCEPT THE GROUND RULES, ONE OF WHICH IS THE RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO EXIST AS A STATE IN THE AREA. WHETHER THE PLO OVER FIVE YEARS WILL CHANGE ITS POSITION, OR WHETHER THERE WILL BE ELEMENTS THAT WILL LEAVE THE PLO AND ACCEPT THE BASIS OF NEGOTIATIONS AND BECOME ACCEPTABLE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PALESTINIANS IS SOMETHING ONLY HISTORY WILL ANSWER. ONE OF THE NECESSARY INGREDIENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF A NEGOTIATION DURING AN INTERIM PERIOD FOR A FINAL SETTLEMENT HAS GOT TO BE

THE EMERGENCE OF ACCEPTABLE AND RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN FOR THE PALESTINIANS, WHO WERE WILLING TO ENGAGE IN NEGOTIATIONS POINTING TOWARDS A PEACE SETTLEMENT THAT ACCEPTS ISRAEL AS A NEIGHBOR AND AS A SOVEREIGN STATE, WITH WHICH THEY WILL LIVE IN PEACE. I KEEP COMING BACK TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INTERIM PERIOD. IT'S A PERIOD DURING WHICH THE DYNAMIC PROCESS WILL BE SET IN MOTION, HOPEFULLY, IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY.

QUESTION: WHY CAN'T THIS BE LEFT VAGUE, IF IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO NAIL IT DOWN. WHY DOES THE U.S. FEEL WE NOW HAVE TO SAY WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FIVE YEARS?

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 13 STATE 083012

ANSWER: WE ARE NOT SAYING YOU CAN NAIL DOWN EVERY DETAIL OF WHAT HAPPENS IN FIVE YEARS. IN FACT WE ARE SAYING THE CONTRARY, THAT YOU HAVE PUT OFF FOR NOW THE ULTIMATE AND FINAL DECISIONS. BUT IN ORDER TO GET THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS STARTED ON WHAT WILL ULTIMATELY HAPPEN, YOU HAVE TO START FROM A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED FRAMEWORK. THAT IS RESOLUTION 242 AS IT HAS BEEN GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD, INCLUDING THE APPLICATION OF ALL THE PRINCIPLES OF THAT RESOLUTION TO ALL OF THE FRONTS WHERE TERRITORY WAS OCCUPIED IN 1967. WITHOUT ACCEPTANCE OF THAT COMMON STARTING POINT FOR NEGOTIATIONS, WE DON'T THINK YOU ARE GOING TO GET THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS STARTED. THAT'S THE POINT. ACCEPTING THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLES, INCLUDING THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO ALL FRONTS, INCLUDING THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, IS NOT THE SAME THING AS A COMMITMENT TO WITHDRAW. WITHDRAWAL DEPENDS ON AGREEMENT ON A LOT OF THINGS WE ARE NOT TRYING TO PREDETERMINE, SUCH AS MODIFICATIONS IN THE BORDER, SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS INCLUDING ISRAEL'S ROLE IN THAT AREA FOR SECURITY PURPOSES, THE KIND OF POLITICAL STRUCTURE THAT MIGHT EMERGE AND THE DECISIONS THAT THAT POLITICAL STRUCTURE MIGHT MAKE WITH REGARD TO ITS FUTURE RELATIONSHIPS WITH ISRAEL AND JORDAN. IF YOU DO NOT ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE THAT IF EVERYTHING CAN BE WORKED OUT THERE WILL BE WITHDRAWAL, THEN YOU DON'T EVEN GET STARTED. YOU DO NOT EVEN HAVE A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED BASIS THAT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED IN THE PAST.

QUESTION: BUT WHY DO YOU HAVE TO INSIST NOW ON A PLEBESCITE OR EVEN SOME FORM OF EXPRESSION FOR THE RESIDENTS ABOUT THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE THEY WANT IN FIVE YEARS?

ANSWER: WELL, IT IS A MATTER OF PRACTICAL JUDGMENT. WHATEVER IT IS THAT EMERGES SEEMS TO US HAS TO BE SUB-LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 14 STATE 083012

MITTED FOR THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED. THAT PRINCIPLE AT LEAST HAS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED.

QUESTION: IF THE ISRAELIS WOULD AGREE TO THE PRINCIPLE OF A REVIEW AND STATE THAT THIS REVIEW, WHICH WILL BE THE RESULT OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL, THE PALESTINIANS, EGYPT, AND JORDAN, THAT THEY WILL ALL DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR PERIOD COME UP WITH SOME FORMULA ACCEPTABLE TO ALL THAT WILL GIVE THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE--WHAT WOULD BE WRONG WITH THAT?

ANSWER: PERHAPS THAT WOULD BE ENOUGH, IF YOU COULD GET AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE PARTICIPATION OF THE POPULATION IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THEN ARE YOU SQUEEZING BEGIN ON HOLDING A PLEBESCITE?

ANSWER: HOW ONE ULTIMATELY FORMULATES THE WAY IN WHICH THE PEOPLE PARTICIPATE IS STILL QUITE OPEN TO NEGOTIATION. THAT IS WHY I WAS VERY CAREFUL TO SAY WE WERE NOT WEDDED TO THE WORD PLEBESCITE OR THE WORD REFERENDUM, OR ANY PARTICULAR FORM. IT IS THE CONCEPT YOU HAVE TO FIND SOME WAY TO HAVE THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED MANIFESTED IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: HASN'T THE CONCEPT ALREADY BEEN AGREED BY ISRAEL?

ANSWER: I THINK THE DIFFERENCES HERE IS THAT THE SELF-RULE PLAN DEALS WITH THE FUTURE OF THE STATUS OF THE PEOPLE. WHAT IS NOT COVERED IS THE FUTURE STATUS LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 15 STATE 083012

OF THE TERRITORY. THERE IS AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION HERE. WE SAY YOU CANNOT TALK ABOUT HOW THE PEOPLE GOVERN THEMSELVES WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE TERRITORY IN WHICH THEY LIVE. THAT IS WHERE YOU GET BACK TO THE PRINCIPLE OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO THE WEST BANK. THAT DEALS WITH THE TERRITORY AS WELL AS WITH THE WAY THE PEOPLE LIVE AND WHAT ROLE THEY HAVE IN RUNNING THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. THAT IS PERHAPS THE KEY DISTINCTION HERE THAT HAS NOT BEEN BRIDGED.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DETECTED ANY SIGN OF A SOFTENING OR WILLINGNESS ON THE PART OF THE ARABS TO ASSIMILATE THE PALESTINIANS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT REALLY TALKED ABOUT THAT. THAT GETS TO THE SOLUTION OF THE REFUGEE PROBLEM. HERE THE ARAB POSITION IS THAT YOU CANNOT SETTLE THE REFUGEE PROBLEM UNTIL YOU SETTLE THE POLITICAL PROBLEM. ONCE THERE IS A SOLUTION TO THE POLITICAL PROBLEM THEN YOU CAN DEAL ALSO WITH THE REFUGEES IN TERMS OF RESETTLEMENT, COMPENSATION, AND ALL THE OTHER OPTIONS THAT ARE ALWAYS DISCUSSED. NO ARAB GOVERNMENT UP TO NOW HAS BEEN WILLING TO ISOLATE THAT REFUGEES PROBLEM FROM THE OVERALL PROBLEM. AS WE PHRASED IT AT ASWAN, SETTLEMENT OF THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM "IN ALL ITS ASPECTS", WHICH MEANS THE REFUGEE ASPECT AND IT ALSO MEANS THE TERRITORIAL ASPECT.

QUESTION: IS IT A FOREGOING CONCLUSION NOW THERE WON'T BE A SEPARATE PEACE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND EGYPT?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO SAY ANYTHING IS FOREGONE. AT THIS POINT THERE IS NO INDICATION OF ANY CHANGE IN PRESIDENT SADAT'S BASIC APPROACH. THAT IS WHY HE ATTACHES SO MUCH IMPORTANCE TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 16 STATE 083012

EGYPT CLEARLY SEES THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS IN THE MILITARY COMMITTEE AND MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. PRESIDENT SADAT WANTS TO ESTABLISH A FRAMEWORK FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE. WHETHER OTHERS WILL ACCEPT THAT FRAMEWORK IS AN OPEN QUESTION. IT DEPENDS ON HOW CREDIBLE A FRAMEWORK IT IS. WHAT EGYPT WILL THEN DO ABOUT ITS OWN BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS IS ALSO AN OPEN QUESTION. YOU CAN'T ANSWER YOUR QUESTION WITHOUT GETTING TO THE POINT WHERE THERE IS AGREEMENT ON THE FRAMEWORK--THAT IS THE DECLARATION--AND POSSIBLY SOME UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT COMES AFTER THAT IN TERMS OF THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM, IN TERMS OF AN INTERIM ARRANGEMENT FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA WHICH IS BASED UPON 242 AS IT HAS GENERALLY BEEN INTERPRETED.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU MADE ANY SPECIAL EFFORTS RECENTLY TO ESTABLISH CONTACT WITH THE PALESTINIAN ARABS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOTHING BEYOND THE NORMAL ONES WE HAVE THROUGH OUR DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR REPRESENTATIVES THERE. THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE IN OUR PRACTICES THERE.

QUESTION: WHAT'S THE POINT IN SADAT'S INVITING WEIZMAN TO CAIRO WHEN HE KNOWS BEGIN HAS NOTHING TO PRESENT WHICH IS AT LEAST AS FAR-REACHING AS WHAT PRESIDENT CARTER HAS PRESENTED TO BEGIN AND HE REJECTED?

ANSWER: MY GUESS IS THAT SADAT WILL TALK TO WEIZMAN NOT ABOUT WHAT THE PRESIDENT TALKED ABOUT. RATHER HE WILL TALK ABOUT WHAT HE HAS ALWAYS TALKED ABOUT, AND THAT GOES FURTHER THAN WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAD TO SAY. I DON'T
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 17 STATE 083012

REALLY KNOW. IT WAS PRIME MINISTER BEGIN'S INITIATIVE, NOT OURS. I DON'T KNOW WHY SADAT SHOULD ACCEPT POSITIONS WHICH ARE LESS THAN THE ONES WE THINK ARE THE BASIS FOR

COMPROMISE. AND THE POINT IS THAT SADAT HAS NOT ACCEPTED THOSE POSITIONS, EITHER, UP TO THE PRESENT TIME. IF HE DID, THEN THE QUESTION WOULD BE WHETHER THEY COULD BE ACCEPTED, AS UP TO NOW THEY HAVE NOT BEEN, BY THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT.

QUESTION: DO YOU SUSPECT THAT WEIZMAN MAY BE CARRYING PROPOSALS WITH CONCESSIONS WHICH ISRAEL FINDS MORE PREFERABLE TO BE MAKING TO SADAT THAN TO CARTER?

ANSWER: I HAVE NO BASIS OF KNOWING WHETHER YOUR SUSPICION IS CORRECT. TO THE EXTENT THAT THESE THINGS CAN BE WORKED OUT DIRECTLY BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THAT'S FINE WITH US. WE HAVE NO PRIDE OF PLACE. WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF THIS BECAUSE THERE WEREN'T DISCUSSIONS GOING ON AND WE WERE ASKED TO KEEP THE PROCESS GOING INDIRECTLY. WE HAVE A SELF-LIQUIDATING ROLE. I AM NOT WEDDED TO THIS JOB FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE. REALISTICALLY, I DON'T THINK WE ARE AT THE POINT WHERE THE TWO SIDES CAN DEAL DIRECTLY AND THE UNITED STATES DOESN'T HAVE TO PLAY THE MIDDLEMAN ROLE. THEY NEED SOMEONE TO INTERPRET EACH TO THE OTHER, AND TO HELP FIND WAYS TO BREAK IMPASSES.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US AN AUTHORITATIVE VERSION OF YOUR IDEAS BEING DISCUSSED? FOR INSTANCE, LAST NIGHT MARVIN KALB ON TELEVISION SAID SOMETHING ABOUT THE STRAIGHTENING OF THE BORDER, WIDENING THE NARROW STRIP ALONG THE JORDAN.

ANSWER: WE HAVE PUT FORWARD NO IDEAS ABOUT WHERE THE LINE SHOULD BE DRAWN, OR WHAT MODIFICATIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE. WE HAVE NOT GOTTEN INTO THAT KIND OF SPECIFIC LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 18 STATE 083012

PROPOSAL. I ASSUME YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE WEST BANK.

QUESTION: YES.

ANSWER: NO, THAT IS NOT ONE OF THE IDEAS. I WILL SPEAK OF THE GENERAL AREAS THEY DEALT WITH. THEY HAVE TO DO WITH THE NEED TO FIND A FORMULA THAT WILL MAKE UNAMBIGUOUSLY CLEAR THAT RESOLUTION 242 IN ALL ITS PRINCIPLES APPLIES ON ALL FRONTS. ALL THE FORMULAS THAT HAVE BEEN

SUGGESTED LEAVE THAT QUESTION UNCLEAR. OUR FEELING IS WHY NOT JUST SAY IT. WE HAVE ENOUGH AMBIGUITY IN 242 WITHOUT HAVING MORE AMBIGUITY.

SECONDLY, WE HAVE VIEWS CLEARLY ON SETTLEMENTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES, AND WHAT WOULD BE HELPFUL THERE IN NOT

CREATING ADDITIONAL IMPEDIMENTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. I CANNOT GET INTO THE DETAILS OF THESE IDEAS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY IN BOTH THESE AREAS.

QUESTION: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

ANSWER: I AM TALKING ABOUT NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY. I HAVE SEEN REPORTS THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR THE DISBANDMENT OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS. THEY ARE NOT CORRECT. WE HAVE RECOGNIZED THAT THE EXISTING SETTLEMENTS ARE THERE, AND THEIR FUTURE IS PART OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS THERE SHOULD BE NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY.

QUESTION: BY NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY, YOU MEAN NO EXPANSION OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 19 STATE 083012

ANSWER: YES, I USE "NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY" ADVISEDLY. I MEAN IT IS UNDESIRABLE TO HAVE MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY. THERE SHOULD BE A FREEZE--NO EXPANDING THEM, NO ENLARGING THEM.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE NOT INDICATED THAT AT THE END OF THE PROCESS ISRAEL WOULD HAVE TO ABANDON THE SETTLEMENTS IN THE RAFAH SALIENT?

ANSWER: WE HAVE SAID THAT A FUTURE SOLUTION TO THEM HAS TO BE FOUND IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. WE HAVE TALKED IN TERMS OF WHETHER THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO ISRAELI DEFENSE FORCES PROTECTING THE SETTLEMENTS. WE ARE NOT SAYING THAT SADAT WILL ACCEPT THE SETTLEMENTS THERE IF THEY ARE UNDER UN OR EGYPTIAN PROTECTION. ALL WE ARE SAYING IS THAT IF THE ELEMENT OF ISRAELI DEFENSE FORCES THERE PROTECTING THEM WERE REMOVED, THIS MIGHT OPEN POSSIBILITIES NOT THERE NOW. THE ISRAELI POSITION AS I UNDERSTAND IT IS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD REMAIN AND THEY SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY ISRAELI SECURITY FORCES IN SOME WAY. WE ARE ASKING THE QUESTION ABOUT ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF PROTECTION--I DON'T KNOW IF IT WOULD OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES.

QUESTION: SO YOU ARE SAYING SECRETARY VANCE'S STATEMENT THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT EXIST DID NOT MEAN THAT

ISRAEL SHOULD NECESSARILY DISMANTLE THEM?

ANSWER: THAT'S RIGHT. WHAT THAT FORMULATION REALLY MEANT WAS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED.

QUESTION: WHY SHOULD ISRAEL TRUST YOU, TRUST YOUR SECURITY COMMITMENTS OR GUARANTEES, WHEN IT IS OBVIOUS THAT YOU ARE NOT KEEPING UP YOUR COMMITMENT TO US ABOUT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 20 STATE 083012

THE PLANES? YOU ARE WEDDING THAT COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL FO 1975 TO OTHER COMMITMENTS TO THE ARABS, AND PUTTING FORWARD THE PLANES IN A PACKAGE.

ANSWER: GO BACK AND REVIEW THAT COMMITMENT. IT WAS THAT WE WOULD TAKE STEPS TO ASSURE THE MAINTENANCE OF ISRAEL'S DEFENSIVE CAPABILITIES THROUGH THE PROVISION OF ADVANCED WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE F-16. SINCE THEN THERE HAVE BEEN A GREAT MANY THINGS APPROVED--F-15S FOR EXAMPLE, AND A LOT OF OTHER EQUIPMENT. I THINK WE ARE MAINTAINING OUR COMMITMENT.

QUESTION: BUT NOW YOU ARE INTRODUCING A NEW ELEMENT; YOU ARE CONDITIONING THE PLANES ON SOMETHING THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH US. SO IF WE GET ANOTHER SECURITY COMMITMENT FROM YOU, A FEW YEARS FROM NOW WE WILL FIND WE ARE DEPENDENT UPON SOME EXTRANEIOUS CONDITION YOU MAKE.

ANSWER: BUT WE ARE PROPOSING TO SELL YOU THE F-16S. WE ARE NOT PROPOSING NOT TO SELL THEM. WE SIMPLY THINK THAT THERE ARE SOME OTHER COMMITMENTS ALSO, INCLUDING A COMMITMENT THAT WAS MADE ALMOST THAT LONG AGO TO SELL A MODERN AIRCRAFT TO THE SAUDIS.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THE LINKAGE?

ANSWER: THE ANSWER IS THAT WE FEEL THAT THIS IS NOT IN VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT OF THE COMMITMENT, THAT WE ARE PROPOSING TO MAKE THE SALE. WE ALSO THINK THE OTHERS ARE VERY IMPORTANT FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW.

QUESTION: BUT THIS HAS RAISED QUESTIONS IN ISRAEL ABOUT THE RELIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES AS A PARTNER
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 21 STATE 083012

IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: I FIND IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW THERE CAN BE ANY REAL QUESTION ABOUT OUR COMMITMENT TO THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL, GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND THE VOLUME OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT THAT HAS BEEN SOLD AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE SOLD. IT SEEMS TO ME THIS

COMMITMENT HAS BEEN SO AMPLY DEMONSTRATED OVER THE YEARS THAT THERE OUGHT NOT TO BE ANY QUESTION ABOUT IT. I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION. WE SIMPLY DO NOT AGREE THAT SELLING THOSE PLANES TO SAUDI ARABIA IS PROBLEM FOR THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: BUT WASN'T THE LINKAGE MADE TO MAKE THE SALE OF THE SAUDI AND EGYPTIAN PLANES MORE PALATABLE TO CONGRESS?

ANSWER: IT WAS DONE BECAUSE WE THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL OF THESE SALES GO THROUGH FOR THE SAKE OF OUR OWN POLICIES AND OUR OWN INTERESTS IN THE AREA; WE DO NOT THINK IT WILL CHANGE THE BALANCE. I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS WOULD BE KEPT IN PROPORTION, AND NOT SINGLED OUT TO SHOW THAT THE UNITED STATES IS NOT A RELIABLE PARTNER OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT DAYAN IS COMING?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NO DEFINITE PROPOSAL. OF COURSE, WE WILL BE TALKING OVER THE COMING WEEKS, BUT NOTHING IS DEFINITE YET. UNQUOTE COOPER UNQUOTE COOPER

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 STATE 083012
ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 EUR-12 IO-13 ISO-00 SIG-03 /049 R

66011

DRAFTED BY:NEA/IAI:MGANDERSON

APPROVED BY:NEA/IAI:MCHILL

-----118796 051129Z /21

R 050610Z APR 78

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

INFO RUFHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME 0000

AMEMBASSY RABAT

AMEMBASSY ALGIERS

AMEMBASSY TUNIS

AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI

AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM

AMEMBASSY SANA

AMEMBASSY MUSCAT

AMEMBASSY DOHA

AMEMBASSY ABU DHABI

AMEMBASSY MANAMA

AMEMBASSY KUWAIT

USINT BAGHDAD

AMEMBASSY TEHRAN

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
AMEMBASSY DUBLIN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 083012

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 083012 SENT ACTION LONDON USNATO APR 01.
QUOTE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012

LONDON FOR KINSOLVING

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 083012 TOOSEC 030126 SENT ACTION
TEL AVIV INFO JERUSALEM AMMAN DAMASCUS CAIRO JIDDA USDEL
SECRETARY BEIRUT MAR 31.
QUOTE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 083012 TOSEC 030126

FOR HODDING CARTER

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PEPR, IS

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND BRIEFING TO SEVEN ISRAELI
CORRESPONDENTS
SECRETARY ACKNOWLEDGE ONLY

1. FOLLOWING IS A CLOSE PARAPHRASE OF A ONE-HOUR BACK-
GROUND SESSION WHICH ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON HAD WITH
THE SEVEN ISRAELI CORRESPONDENTS BASED IN WASHINGTON.
AGREED ATTRIBUTION WAS TO BE TO "AN AMERICAN OFFICIAL".
AT OUTSET NOTE THAT ATHERTON MADE THE POINT THAT HE WAS
RESPONDING TO THEIR REPEATED REQUESTS FOR A BACKGROUND
BRIEFING, AND THEY RESPONDED ALL HAD AGREED TO NOTE THAT
FACT IN ANY STORIES WRITTEN.

2. BEGIN TEXT:

WE HAVE JUST HAD A SESSION WITH THE PRIME MINISTER HERE IN
WHICH VERY SERIOUS TALKS WERE HELD AND VERY SERIOUS IS-
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 083012

SUES DISCUSSED. THE PRESIDENT MADE SOME SUGGESTIONS AND PUT FORTH SOME IDEAS ON WHICH WE HAVE ASKED THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT TO REFLECT, WITH THE VIEW OF TRYING TO MOVE THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS FORWARD. WE FULLY RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS THE NEED FOR TIME FOR THESE DISCUSSIONS TO TAKE PLACE IN ISRAEL AND FOR THESE IDEAS TO BE REFLECTED UPON. AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME WE ASSUME THERE WILL BE A

RESPONSE TO US ON THESE IDEAS IN DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS. I WANT, ABOVE ALL, TO AVOID THE IMPRESSION THAT WE ARE TRYING TO INTERFERE IN OR INFLUENCE OR IN ANY WAY TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION OF PRESSING ON THAT INTERNAL DISCUSSION IN ISRAEL. I AM CONCERNED THAT STORIES COMING OUT OF THIS KIND OF A SESSION MIGHT BE SO INTERPRETED. I WANTED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I AM RESPONDING TO A REQUEST FOR THIS BRIEFING AND NOT TRYING TO PLUG ANY PARTICULAR LINE.

QUESTION: HOW SERIOUS IS THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE U.S. AND ISRAEL RIGHT NOW?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO USE THE WORD CONFRONTATION. I THINK THERE ARE SERIOUS ISSUES ON WHICH WE HAVE SERIOUS DIFFERENCES. TO DISGUISE THAT FACT WOULD NOT DO A SERVICE TO THE OBJECTIVES THAT IN THE LONG RUN WE AND ISRAEL BOTH HAVE IN TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO GET AROUND THE IMPASSES AND OBSTACLES IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE DIFFERENCES ARE ON VERY FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF POLICY.

QUESTION: IS THE U.S. COMING FORWARD WITH ITS OWN IDEAS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT PUT THESE FORWARD AS AN AMERICAN PROPOSAL OR AMERICAN PLAN. SOME IDEAS WERE PUT OUT IN AN EXPLORATORY WAY TO BE DISCUSSED FURTHER BETWEEN US AND ISRAEL. WE HAVE NOT PUT OUT TIMETABLES FOR SETTING FORTH AMERICAN IDEAS OR PROPOSALS. WE DO NOT RULE OUT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 083012

AT SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE PUTTING FORWARD IDEAS OR PROPOSALS TO BRIDGE THE GAPS, WHEN WE THINK THIS MIGHT BE HELPFUL IN ADVANCING THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS. THIS WOULD NOT OCCUR UNTIL AFTER SERIOUS CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN US AND BOTH ISRAEL AND EGYPT. WE ARE NOW IN THE PROCESS OF CONSULTATION TO TRY TO REACH SOME JUDGMENTS ON WHEN A CONTRIBUTION FROM US WOULD HAVE A CONSTRUCTIVE RESULT.

QUESTION: THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER SEEMED TO DISCUSS, FROM WHAT HAS COME OUT, SPECIFICS WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA--NOT SINAI. IS THIS A PART OF WHAT IS CALLED THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES?

ANSWER: NO, THEY ARE NOT PART OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. TO ANSWER YOU, I HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE AGENDA OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. THERE WERE THREE ITEMS (1) THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE SETTLEMENT, (2) GUIDELINES FOR NEGOTIATING ISSUES DEALING WITH THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. THE PRINCIPLE FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS SINCE THEN, INCLUDING MY TRIP IN THE AREA AND THE DISCUSSIONS WHEN THE PRIME

MINISTER WAS HERE AND PARTICULARLY THE TALKS BETWEEN THE SECRETARY AND DAYAN, HAVE BEEN ON TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO GET AN AGREED DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. YOU CAN'T SEPARATE THE ISSUES OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA FROM THE DECLARATION. THE TWO DEAL WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIANS. WHEN YOU TALK OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES, YOU GET INTO WHAT HAPPENS NEXT, WHAT IS THE FOLLOW-ON WITH REGARD TO WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. IN DISCUSSING THE ISSUES DURING THE PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT IT WAS NOT ARTIFICALLY COMPARTMENTALIZED BETWEEN THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ON ONE HAND AND LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 083012

WEST BANK-GAZA-PALESTINIAN PROBLEMS ON THE OTHER. THEY ARE INTERRELATED AND IT IS NECESSARY TO MOVE BACK AND FORTH FROM ONE TO THE OTHER AS THE DISCUSSIONS GO ON. THE THIRD AGENDA ITEM (3) DEALS WITH THE ELEMENTS OF A PEACE TREATY, THE IDEA BEING THAT THAT WOULD BE A KIND OF MODEL FOR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND OTHER ARAB GOVERNMENTS AFTER IT HAD BEEN AGREED UPON BY ISRAEL AND EGYPT.

QUESTION: SO IN EFFECT ON THE SECOND ITEM OF THE AGENDA, ISRAEL WAS NEGOTIATING WITH EGYPT OVER THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOT YET. I WOULD NOT SAY THERE HAS BEEN ANY DIRECT NEGOTIATION BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL ON THAT QUESTION. I HAVE DISCUSSED WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL, AND TO A CERTAIN EXTENT WITH JORDAN IN MY LAST TRIP TO AMMAN IN A VERY EXPLORATIVE AND TENTATIVE WAY, THIS SECOND AGENDA ITEM. LET'S REMEMBER THERE IS A PROPOSAL ON THE TABLE THAT RELATES TO THAT ITEM. IT IS THE PRIME MINISTER'S SELF-RULE PROPOSAL FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA THAT COMES UNDER THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. IT IS A PROPOSAL FOR THE CHANGE OF STATUS WITH REGARD TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, THAT WAS FORMALLY PRESENTED TO EGYPT, TO PRESIDENT SADAT AT ISMAILIA. IT HAS BEEN WELL PUBLICIZED AND THEREFORE IS THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION IN THE ARAB WORLD. IT HAS ALSO BEEN THE SUBJECT OF SOME DISCUSSION BETWEEN US AND THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT IDEAS THAT WOULD MOVE

THE NEGOTIATIONS FORWARD, WE WERE NOT ONLY CONCERNED WITH ELEMENTS OF THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES DEALING WITH WITHDRAWAL AND THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION, BUT ALSO WITH WHAT COMES NEXT REGARDING WEST BANK AND GAZA ARRANGEMENTS. SO THE IDEAS WE HAVE SUGGESTED DEAL WITH BOTH OF THESE AREAS AND THEY ALSO DEAL WITH A COUPLE OF THE ISSUES ON SINAI.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 083012

QUESTION: DID THESE IDEAS EVOLVE WITH THE EGYPTIANS

AND HAVE THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY ACCEPTED THEM IN PRINCIPLE OR ARE THESE PURELY AMERICAN IDEAS THAT ARE NOW PRESENTED TO BOTH SIDES?

ANSWER: THESE ARE AMERICAN IDEAS THAT IN MANY CASES HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE EGYPTIANS. THEY REPRESENT IDEAS WE THINK MIGHT BECOME REASONABLE COMPROMISES BETWEEN ISRAELI AND EGYPTIAN NEGOTIATORS. THEY HAVE BEEN IN SOME CASES THE SUBJECT OF OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE EGYPTIANS AND INEVITABLY HAVE INVOLVED PRINCIPLES AND INFORMALLY, WEST BANK-GAZA AGREEMENTS. ON MY LAST TRIP I GOT INTO SOME OF THESE WITH BOTH EGYPT AND ISRAEL. THEY ARE OUR THINKING AT THIS POINT, BUT WE HAVE NOT FORMALIZED THEM. WE ARE STILL FEELING OUR WAY TO TRY TO FIND WAYS THAT THE PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED. WE HAVE PUT THEM FORTH IN THIS SPIRIT.

QUESTION: WHEN THE PRESIDENT READS FROM A LIST OF ASSUMPTIONS AND DESCRIBES SIX ISRAELI POSITIONS THAT ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE, DOESN'T THAT GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT THERE ALREADY IS AN AMERICAN PLAN? THEY GET INTO SUCH A SPECIFICITY THAT IT SEEMS THAT THE AMERICAN PLAN HAS ALREADY BEEN PUT FORWARD?

ANSWER: I DON'T AGREE WITH THAT. CLEARLY, THEY MAY FORESHADOW THE WAY THAT OUR IDEAS ARE TAKING SHAPE IN OUR OWN MINDS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY NOT PUT FORWARD ON A TAKE-IT-OR-LEAVE-IT BASIS. THEY ARE THE BEST JUDGMENT WE CAN MAKE ON WHAT IS GOING TO BE NECESSARY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS IN THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI NEGOTIATIONS. THEY ARE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 083012

NOT A PLAN. WE HAVE NOT PUT THEM FORWARD AS A PLAN.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE GIVEN THESE IDEAS TO THE ISRAELIS AND ASKED THEM TO MULL THEM OVER.

ANSWER: WE THINK IF THESE WERE ACCEPTABLE TO THE ISRAELIS, IT WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO BRIDGE THE GAPS AND GET THE NEGOTIATIONS GOING AGAIN. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT AT THIS POINT THEY ARE ALREADY ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. IN SEVERAL INSTANCES THEY ARE NOT.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US ANY INSTANCES?

ANSWER: FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE QUESTION OF WITHDRAWAL, EGYPT'S PREFERRED FORMULATION ON THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE INTERPRETED AS A COMMITMENT TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL. WE HAVE ALWAYS DECLINED TO ACCEPT THAT INTERPRETATION OF RESOLUTION 242 AND WE DO NOT THINK THAT YOU ARE GOING

TO GET A PRINCIPLE THAT ISRAEL WOULD AGREE TO, OR WHICH WE WOULD SUPPORT, IF IT REQUIRES A COMMITMENT IN ADVANCE TO TOTAL WITHDRAWAL.

QUESTION: ON SINAI TOO?

ANSWER: I'M TALKING ABOUT ANY FRONT. SINAI IS ALREADY IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY BECAUSE THE ISRAELI PROPOSAL WHICH WAS GIVEN TO SADAT IS, IN EFFECT, A PROPOSAL WHICH INCLUDES ACCEPTANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER AS THE FINAL BORDER. IN OTHER WORDS, AT THE END OF ALL PHASES OF IMPLEMENTATION (IN THE SINAI), THERE WOULD BE WITHDRAWAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL BORDER, ASSUMING THAT THE SECURITY ISSUES OF DEMILITARIZATION, FUTURE OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND SO FORTH WERE WORKED OUT. AT THIS POINT THIS IS REALLY AN ACADEMIC ISSUE. THE REAL PLACE WHERE THE WITHDRAWAL ISSUE FOCUSES IS THE WEST BANK.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 08 STATE 083012

ANOTHER EXAMPLE IS HOW YOU FORMULATE THE PALESTINIAN PRINCIPLE IN THE PALESTINIAN-WEST BANK-GAZA QUESTION. THE EGYPTIANS HAVE ALWAYS SAID THEY THINK THERE SHOULD BE SELF-DETERMINATION WITHOUT ANY QUALIFICATIONS. WE PUT FORWARD A FORMULATION WHEN THE PRESIDENT WAS IN ASWAN, THAT SPEAKS OF PARTICIPATION OF THE PALESTINIANS IN DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE--WHICH IS CERTAINLY NOT UNQUALIFIED AND UNLIMITED SELF-DETERMINATION. OUR FORMULATION AT THIS POINT HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY EITHER SIDE.

QUESTION: HOW COME? HAVEN'T THE EGYPTIANS ALREADY INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE ACCEPTED IT?

ANSWER: ALL I'M SAYING IS THE LAST PROPOSAL WE HAVE HAD FROM THE EGYPTIANS IN TEXTUAL FORM DOES NOT ACCEPT THE ASWAN LANGUAGE. I THINK WE HAVE MADE A JUDGMENT THAT PROBABLY IN THE END THIS WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

QUESTION: WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SAID CONTRADICTS THE TWO FAMOUS ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT IN SPEAKING TO BEGIN-- YOU SAY THE EGYPTIANS WANT FULL SELF-DETERMINATION AND FULL WITHDRAWAL; YET THERE ARE TWO ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PUT AGAINST THE SIX BEGIN "NO'S". THAT IS, THE PRESIDENT'S TWO ASSUMPTIONS WERE REPORTED TO BE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATE, WHICH EVERYONE ASSUMES WOULD BE THE OUTCOME IF THERE WERE PURE SELF-DETERMINATION, AND, SECONDLY, THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE TOTAL WITHDRAWAL ON THE WEST BANK?

ANSWER: FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF OUR APPROACH, OF OUR VIEW OF WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE COMPROMISE DECLARA-

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 09 STATE 083012

TION OF PRINCIPLES--WE THINK IT HAS TO BE BASED ON THESE TWO ASSUMPTIONS. I'M NOT SAYING AT THIS POINT THAT THESE ASSUMPTIONS ARE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT WE THINK THEY SHOULD BE ACCEPTED BY EGYPT AT SUCH TIME WE GET TO THAT POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: IF ISRAEL ACCEPTS THE ASWAN FORMULA AND THE APPLICABILITY OF 242 TO ALL FRONTS, YOU ARE STILL NOT SURE THAT EGYPT AGREES?

ANSWER: WE CAN'T BE SURE UNTIL WE'VE GOTTEN AN EGYPTIAN REACTION. ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT IN OUR JUDGMENT THERE IS A VERY GOOD CHANCE THAT EGYPT WILL ACCEPT, BASED UPON OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EGYPTIAN POSITION.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED IT WITH THE EGYPTIANS AND JORDANIANS AFTER THE BEGIN VISIT?

ANSWER: I WAS SPEAKING OF DISCUSSIONS I HAD IN THE AREA BEFORE THE BEGIN VISIT. WE HAVE BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE JORDANIANS AND EGYPTIANS TO GIVE THEM A BRIEFING OF THE DISCUSSIONS DURING THE BEGIN VISITS. WE ALWAYS DO, JUST AS WE DID IN REVERSE WHEN SADAT IS HERE. WE SENT A REPORT ON THIS TO THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT. BUT WE HAVE NOT BEEN IN A NEGOTIATING EXCHANGE WITH THE JORDANIANS OR EGYPTIANS SINCE THE BEGIN VISIT, BECAUSE AT THIS POINT WE ARE WAITING FOR THE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE ISRAELIS AND OURSELVES TO MOVE FORWARD BEYOND WHERE THEY WERE AT THE END OF THE BEGIN VISIT.

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THE WEIZMAN VISIT TO EGYPT?

ANSWER: FIRST OF ALL I THINK IT IS A VERY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT. THE FACT THAT DIRECT TALKS ARE RESUMING

IS HOPEFUL, AND IT REFLECTS A FEELING IN BOTH ISRAEL
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 10 STATE 083012

AND EGYPT THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO CAST AROUND NOT TO
LET THE PROCESS STARTED
AFTER JERUSALEM COMES TO AN
END.
THE PRIME MINISTER, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, SUGGESTED A
RESUMPTION OF TALKS AND THE EGYPTIANS RESPONDED THAT
THEY AGREED TO INVITING WEIZMAN TO COME FOR TALKS WITH
GAMASY. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO KEEP THIS CHANNEL OPEN.

QUESTION: IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF A SOFTENING IN
HUSSEIN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: THE JORDANIANS CONTINUE TO BE IN A WAIT-AND-SEE
POSTURE. THEY HAVE NOT INDICATED ANYTHING NEW ABOUT
THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD JOINING THE NEGOTIATIONS. OBVIOUSLY,

ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF TRYING TO GET AN AGREED DECLARA-
TION OF PRINCIPLES IS TO GET A FRAMEWORK, ON THE BASIS
OF WHICH OTHER STATES, INCLUDING JORDAN IN THE FIRST
INSTANCE, WILL BE WILLING TO JOIN IN THE NEGOTIATIONS,
BUT THERE HAS BEEN NO INDICATION UP TILL NOW FROM JORDAN
WHETHER IT WILL. IT IS SIMPLY WAITING TO SEE WHAT COMES
OUT OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS BEFORE MAKING A JUDGMENT.

QUESTION: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE EGYPTIAN POSITION ON
THE WEST BANK REPRESENT KING HUSSEIN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: I DON'T THINK THE EGYPTIANS CLAIM TO SPEAK FOR
KING HUSSEIN. THEY ARE SAYING THEY HAVE INDEPENDENT
EGYPTIAN VIEWS ON WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE BASIS FOR
KING HUSSEIN'S JUDGMENT OF THIS ISSUE, BUT WHETHER KING
HUSSEIN WILL OR WON'T IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE HIS DECISION,
NOT THE EGYPTIANS. I DON'T THINK HE IS PRETENDING
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 11 STATE 083012

TO SPEAK FOR HUSSEIN. HE IS SPEAKING FOR EGYPT, IN
TERMS OF HIS SENSE OF EGYPT'S RESPONSIBILITY NOT TO IGNORE
THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHER ARABS IN A PEACE SETTLEMENT.
HE IS MAKING JUDGMENTS THAT HE THINKS WOULD PROVIDE A
REASONABLE BASIS. WHETHER OR NOT OTHERS INCLUDING KING
HUSSEIN WILL SEE THAT AS A REASONABLE BASIS REMAINS TO
BE SEEN.

QUESTION: WHAT GUARANTEES OR SAFEGUARDS CAN YOU GIVE
THAT WILL GUARANTEE THAT A PLEBESCITE WILL NOT EVOLVE

INTO A PALESTINIAN STATE?

ANSWER: WE RECOGNIZE THIS IS A VERY DEEP CONCERN ON THE PART OF ISRAEL. THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT DILEMMA SEEMS TO US THAT IT IS INCONCEIVABLE YOU COULD HAVE AN ULTIMATE RESOLUTION OF THE WEST BANK-GAZA ISSUE IN WHICH THERE WAS NO PROVISION FOR THE PEOPLE TO HAVE A VOICE IN DECISIONS AFFECTING THEIR OWN FUTURE, TO BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR CONSENT ON DECISIONS AFFECTING THEM. THIS IS THE DILEMMA. IT IS WHY WE HAVE PUT EMPHASIS IN OUR OWN THINKING ON THE NEED FOR A PROTRACTED INTERIM PERIOD DURING WHICH THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY AND RESOLVE SOME OF THESE CONCERNS ABOUT THE FINAL OUTCOME THROUGH A PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH ISRAEL WILL BE A PARTY. ON THE QUESTION OF HOW YOU STRUCTURE THE ACT BY WHICH THE POPULATION EXPRESSES ITS VIEWS, WE ARE NOT WEDDED TO ANY WORD, WHETHER IT IS "PLEBESCITE" OR "REFERENDUM" OR "RATIFICATION". HOW YOU STRUCTURE THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE POPULATION IS IN ITSELF A SUBJECT FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND ISRAEL WOULD INEVITABLY BE A PARTY TO THOSE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: BUT YOU STILL WANT A REFERENDUM?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO GIVE IT ANY ONE LABEL WHETHER IT'S "REFERENDUM" OR "PLEBESCITE" OR "RATIFICATION". ALL LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 12 STATE 083012

WE ARE SAYING IS THAT SOME WAY HAS TO BE FOUND FOR THE POPULATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ULTIMATE CHOICE THAT IS MADE. AND IT SEEMS TO US THAT IT HAS TO BE DONE BY SOME ACT THAT INVOLVES A VOTE. ANYTHING SHORT OF THAT IS NOT GOING TO BE SEEN AS VALID FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PEOPLE LIVING THERE.

QUESTION: HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFIABLY DEPRIVE THEM OF THE OPTION OF AN INDEPENDENT STATE?

ANSWER: IN LOGIC THERE IS NO GOOD ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. I THINK ONE HAS TO APPROACH IT FROM THE REALITIES, WHICH ARE THAT THE PALESTINIAN ARABS ARE NOT THE ONLY INTERESTED PARTY. THEY CLEARLY HAVE AN INTEREST, BUT SO DOES ISRAEL: ARISING FROM THE FACT THAT IT IS THE PRESENT AUTHORITY IN THAT AREA, SECONDLY, SINCE THE ULTIMATE DISPOSITION OF THIS AREA IS A VALID SECURITY CONCERN OF ISRAEL. JORDAN HAS A ROLE AS THE FORMER ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY. EGYPT, WITH REGARD TO GAZA, FOR THE SAME REASON. THEREFORE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ARGUE THE THEORY OF PURE SELF-DETERMINATION AND AT THE SAME TIME TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE INTERESTS OF THE OTHERS THAT HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THERE ISN'T A

LOGICAL ANSWER, BUT THERE IS A VERY REAL, PRACTICAL, POLITICAL ANSWER, AND THAT IS WHAT OUR JUDGMENTS ARE BASED ON.

QUESTION: WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PLO DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR INTERIM AGREEMENT?

ANSWER: THAT IS SOMETHING ONLY TIME WILL TELL. I CAN'T MAKE A PREDICTION ON SOMETHING THAT IS THAT HYPOTHETICAL. I WOULD MAKE ONLY THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS. THE PLO, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 13 STATE 083012

GIVEN ITS PRESENT POSITION AS REFLECTED IN THE CHARTER, CLEARLY IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE PARTNER IN THE NEGOTIATIONS OR IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE ULTIMATE OUTCOME, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ACCEPT THE GROUND RULES, ONE OF WHICH IS THE RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO EXIST AS A STATE IN THE AREA. WHETHER THE PLO OVER FIVE YEARS WILL CHANGE ITS POSITION, OR WHETHER THERE WILL BE ELEMENTS THAT WILL LEAVE THE PLO AND ACCEPT THE BASIS OF NEGOTIATIONS AND BECOME ACCEPTABLE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PALESTINIANS IS SOMETHING ONLY HISTORY WILL ANSWER. ONE OF THE NECESSARY INGREDIENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF A NEGOTIATION DURING AN INTERIM PERIOD FOR A FINAL SETTLEMENT HAS GOT TO BE

THE EMERGENCE OF ACCEPTABLE AND RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN FOR THE PALESTINIANS, WHO WERE WILLING TO ENGAGE IN NEGOTIATIONS POINTING TOWARDS A PEACE SETTLEMENT THAT ACCEPTS ISRAEL AS A NEIGHBOR AND AS A SOVEREIGN STATE, WITH WHICH THEY WILL LIVE IN PEACE. I KEEP COMING BACK TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INTERIM PERIOD. IT'S A PERIOD DURING WHICH THE DYNAMIC PROCESS WILL BE SET IN MOTION, HOPEFULLY, IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY.

QUESTION: WHY CAN'T THIS BE LEFT VAGUE, IF IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO NAIL IT DOWN. WHY DOES THE U.S. FEEL WE NOW HAVE TO SAY WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FIVE YEARS?

ANSWER: WE ARE NOT SAYING YOU CAN NAIL DOWN EVERY DETAIL OF WHAT HAPPENS IN FIVE YEARS. IN FACT WE ARE SAYING THE CONTRARY, THAT YOU HAVE PUT OFF FOR NOW THE ULTIMATE AND FINAL DECISIONS. BUT IN ORDER TO GET THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS STARTED ON WHAT WILL ULTIMATELY HAPPEN, YOU HAVE TO START FROM A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED FRAMEWORK. THAT IS RESOLUTION 242 AS IT HAS BEEN GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD, INCLUDING THE APPLICATION OF ALL THE PRINCIPLES OF THAT RESOLUTION TO ALL OF THE FRONTS WHERE TERRITORY WAS OCCUPIED IN 1967. WITHOUT ACCEPTANCE OF THAT COMMON LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 14 STATE 083012

STARTING POINT FOR NEGOTIATIONS, WE DON'T THINK YOU ARE GOING TO GET THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS STARTED. THAT'S THE POINT. ACCEPTING THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLES, INCLUDING THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO ALL FRONTS, INCLUDING THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, IS NOT THE SAME THING AS A COMMITMENT TO WITHDRAW. WITHDRAWAL DEPENDS ON AGREEMENT ON A LOT OF THINGS WE ARE NOT TRYING TO PREDETERMINE, SUCH AS MODIFICATIONS IN THE BORDER, SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS INCLUDING ISRAEL'S ROLE IN THAT AREA FOR SECURITY PURPOSES, THE KIND OF POLITICAL STRUCTURE THAT MIGHT EMERGE AND THE DECISIONS THAT THAT POLITICAL STRUCTURE MIGHT MAKE WITH REGARD TO ITS FUTURE RELATIONSHIPS WITH ISRAEL AND JORDAN. IF YOU DO NOT ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE THAT IF EVERYTHING CAN BE WORKED OUT THERE WILL BE WITHDRAWAL, THEN YOU DON'T EVEN GET STARTED. YOU DO NOT EVEN HAVE A COMMONLY-ACCEPTED BASIS THAT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED IN THE PAST.

QUESTION: BUT WHY DO YOU HAVE TO INSIST NOW ON A PLEBESCITE OR EVEN SOME FORM OF EXPRESSION FOR THE RESIDENTS ABOUT THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE THEY WANT IN FIVE YEARS?

ANSWER: WELL, IT IS A MATTER OF PRACTICAL JUDGMENT. WHATEVER IT IS THAT EMERGES SEEMS TO US HAS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED. THAT PRINCIPLE AT LEAST HAS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED.

QUESTION: IF THE ISRAELIS WOULD AGREE TO THE PRINCIPLE OF A REVIEW AND STATE THAT THIS REVIEW, WHICH WILL BE THE RESULT OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL, THE PALESTINIANS, EGYPT, AND JORDAN, THAT THEY WILL ALL DURING THIS FIVE-YEAR PERIOD COME UP WITH SOME FORMULA ACCEPTABLE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 15 STATE 083012

TO ALL THAT WILL GIVE THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE--WHAT WOULD BE WRONG WITH THAT?

ANSWER: PERHAPS THAT WOULD BE ENOUGH, IF YOU COULD GET AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE PARTICIPATION OF THE POPULATION IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THEN ARE YOU SQUEEZING BEGIN ON HOLDING A PLEBESCITE?

ANSWER: HOW ONE ULTIMATELY FORMULATES THE WAY IN WHICH THE PEOPLE PARTICIPATE IS STILL QUITE OPEN TO NEGOTIATION. THAT IS WHY I WAS VERY CAREFUL TO SAY WE WERE

NOT WEDDED TO THE WORD PLEBESCITE OR THE WORD REFERENDUM, OR ANY PARTICULAR FORM. IT IS THE CONCEPT YOU HAVE TO FIND SOME WAY TO HAVE THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED MANIFESTED IN THE DETERMINATION OF THEIR FUTURE.

QUESTION: HASN'T THE CONCEPT ALREADY BEEN AGREED BY ISRAEL?

ANSWER: I THINK THE DIFFERENCES HERE IS THAT THE SELF-RULE PLAN DEALS WITH THE FUTURE OF THE STATUS OF THE PEOPLE. WHAT IS NOT COVERED IS THE FUTURE STATUS OF THE TERRITORY. THERE IS AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION HERE. WE SAY YOU CANNOT TALK ABOUT HOW THE PEOPLE GOVERN THEMSELVES WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE TERRITORY IN WHICH THEY LIVE. THAT IS WHERE YOU GET BACK TO THE PRINCIPLE OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL TO THE WEST BANK. THAT DEALS WITH THE TERRITORY AS WELL AS WITH THE WAY THE PEOPLE LIVE AND WHAT ROLE THEY HAVE IN RUNNING THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. THAT IS PERHAPS THE KEY DISTINCTION HERE THAT HAS NOT BEEN BRIDGED.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 16 STATE 083012

QUESTION: HAVE YOU DETECTED ANY SIGN OF A SOFTENING OR WILLINGNESS ON THE PART OF THE ARABS TO ASSIMILATE THE PALESTINIANS?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT REALLY TALKED ABOUT THAT. THAT GETS TO THE SOLUTION OF THE REFUGEE PROBLEM. HERE THE ARAB POSITION IS THAT YOU CANNOT SETTLE THE REFUGEE PROBLEM UNTIL YOU SETTLE THE POLITICAL PROBLEM. ONCE THERE IS A SOLUTION TO THE POLITICAL PROBLEM THEN YOU CAN DEAL ALSO WITH THE REFUGEES IN TERMS OF RESETTLEMENT, COMPENSATION, AND ALL THE OTHER OPTIONS THAT ARE ALWAYS DISCUSSED. NO ARAB GOVERNMENT UP TO NOW HAS BEEN WILLING TO ISOLATE THAT REFUGEES PROBLEM FROM THE OVERALL PROBLEM. AS WE PHRASED IT AT ASWAN, SETTLEMENT OF THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM "IN ALL ITS ASPECTS", WHICH MEANS THE REFUGEE ASPECT AND IT ALSO MEANS THE TERRITORIAL ASPECT.

QUESTION: IS IT A FOREGOING CONCLUSION NOW THERE WON'T BE A SEPARATE PEACE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND EGYPT?

ANSWER: I DON'T WANT TO SAY ANYTHING IS FOREGONE. AT THIS POINT THERE IS NO INDICATION OF ANY CHANGE IN PRESIDENT SADAT'S BASIC APPROACH. THAT IS WHY HE ATTACHES SO MUCH IMPORTANCE TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. EGYPT CLEARLY SEES THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS IN THE MILITARY COMMITTEE AND MULTILATERAL

NEGOTIATIONS FOR A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. PRESIDENT SADAT WANTS TO ESTABLISH A FRAMEWORK FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE. WHETHER OTHERS WILL ACCEPT THAT FRAMEWORK IS AN OPEN QUESTION. IT DEPENDS ON HOW CREDIBLE A FRAMEWORK IT IS. WHAT EGYPT WILL THEN DO ABOUT ITS OWN BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS IS ALSO AN OPEN QUESTION.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 17 STATE 083012

YOU CAN'T ANSWER YOUR QUESTION WITHOUT GETTING TO THE POINT WHERE THERE IS AGREEMENT ON THE FRAMEWORK--THAT IS THE DECLARATION--AND POSSIBLY SOME UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT COMES AFTER THAT IN TERMS OF THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM, IN TERMS OF AN INTERIM ARRANGEMENT FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA WHICH IS BASED UPON 242 AS IT HAS GENERALLY BEEN INTERPRETED.

QUESTION: HAVE YOU MADE ANY SPECIAL EFFORTS RECENTLY TO ESTABLISH CONTACT WITH THE PALESTINIAN ARABS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA?

ANSWER: NOTHING BEYOND THE NORMAL ONES WE HAVE THROUGH OUR DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR REPRESENTATIVES THERE. THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE IN OUR PRACTICES THERE.

QUESTION: WHAT'S THE POINT IN SADAT'S INVITING WEIZMAN TO CAIRO WHEN HE KNOWS BEGIN HAS NOTHING TO PRESENT WHICH IS AT LEAST AS FAR-REACHING AS WHAT PRESIDENT CARTER HAS PRESENTED TO BEGIN AND HE REJECTED?

ANSWER: MY GUESS IS THAT SADAT WILL TALK TO WEIZMAN NOT ABOUT WHAT THE PRESIDENT TALKED ABOUT. RATHER HE WILL TALK ABOUT WHAT HE HAS ALWAYS TALKED ABOUT, AND THAT GOES FURTHER THAN WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAD TO SAY. I DON'T REALLY KNOW. IT WAS PRIME MINISTER BEGIN'S INITIATIVE, NOT OURS. I DON'T KNOW WHY SADAT SHOULD ACCEPT POSITIONS WHICH ARE LESS THAN THE ONES WE THINK ARE THE BASIS FOR COMPROMISE. AND THE POINT IS THAT SADAT HAS NOT ACCEPTED THOSE POSITIONS, EITHER, UP TO THE PRESENT TIME. IF HE DID, THEN THE QUESTION WOULD BE WHETHER THEY COULD BE ACCEPTED, AS UP TO NOW THEY HAVE NOT BEEN, BY THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT.

QUESTION: DO YOU SUSPECT THAT WEIZMAN MAY BE CARRYING PROPOSALS WITH CONCESSIONS WHICH ISRAEL FINDS MORE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 18 STATE 083012

PREFERABLE TO BE MAKING TO SADAT THAN TO CARTER?

ANSWER: I HAVE NO BASIS OF KNOWING WHETHER YOUR SUSPICION IS CORRECT. TO THE EXTENT THAT THESE THINGS CAN BE WORKED OUT DIRECTLY BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THAT'S FINE WITH US. WE HAVE NO PRIDE OF PLACE. WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF THIS BECAUSE THERE WEREN'T DISCUSSIONS GOING ON AND WE WERE ASKED TO KEEP THE PROCESS GOING INDIRECTLY. WE HAVE A SELF-LIQUIDATING ROLE. I AM NOT WEDDED TO THIS JOB FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE. REALISTICALLY, I DON'T THINK WE ARE AT THE POINT WHERE THE TWO SIDES CAN DEAL DIRECTLY AND THE UNITED STATES DOESN'T HAVE TO PLAY THE MIDDLEMAN ROLE. THEY NEED SOMEONE TO INTERPRET EACH TO THE OTHER, AND TO HELP FIND WAYS TO BREAK IMPASSES.

QUESTION: CAN YOU GIVE US AN AUTHORITATIVE VERSION OF YOUR IDEAS BEING DISCUSSED? FOR INSTANCE, LAST NIGHT MARVIN KALB ON TELEVISION SAID SOMETHING ABOUT THE STRAIGHTENING OF THE BORDER, WIDENING THE NARROW STRIP ALONG THE JORDAN.

ANSWER: WE HAVE PUT FORWARD NO IDEAS ABOUT WHERE THE LINE SHOULD BE DRAWN, OR WHAT MODIFICATIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE. WE HAVE NOT GOTTEN INTO THAT KIND OF SPECIFIC PROPOSAL. I ASSUME YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE WEST BANK.

QUESTION: YES.

ANSWER: NO, THAT IS NOT ONE OF THE IDEAS. I WILL SPEAK OF THE GENERAL AREAS THEY DEALT WITH. THEY HAVE TO DO WITH THE NEED TO FIND A FORMULA THAT WILL MAKE UNAMBIGUOUSLY CLEAR THAT RESOLUTION 242 IN ALL ITS PRINCIPLES LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 19 STATE 083012

APPLIES ON ALL FRONTS. ALL THE FORMULAS THAT HAVE BEEN

SUGGESTED LEAVE THAT QUESTION UNCLEAR. OUR FEELING IS WHY NOT JUST SAY IT. WE HAVE ENOUGH AMBIGUITY IN 242 WITHOUT HAVING MORE AMBIGUITY.

SECONDLY, WE HAVE VIEWS CLEARLY ON SETTLEMENTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES, AND WHAT WOULD BE HELPFUL THERE IN NOT CREATING ADDITIONAL IMPEDIMENTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. I CANNOT GET INTO THE DETAILS OF THESE IDEAS, BUT THEY ARE CLEARLY IN BOTH THESE AREAS.

QUESTION: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

ANSWER: I AM TALKING ABOUT NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY. I HAVE SEEN REPORTS THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR THE DISBANDMENT OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS. THEY ARE NOT CORRECT. WE HAVE RECOGNIZED THAT THE EXISTING SETTLEMENTS ARE

THERE, AND THEIR FUTURE IS PART OF THE NEGOTIATIONS.
WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS THERE SHOULD BE NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY.

QUESTION: BY NO FURTHER SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY, YOU MEAN
NO EXPANSION OF EXISTING SETTLEMENTS?

ANSWER: YES, I USE "NO MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY" ADVISEDLY.
I MEAN IT IS UNDESIRABLE TO HAVE MORE SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY.
THERE SHOULD BE A FREEZE--NO EXPANDING THEM, NO ENLARGING
THEM.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE NOT INDICATED THAT AT THE END OF
THE PROCESS ISRAEL WOULD HAVE TO ABANDON THE SETTLEMENTS
IN THE RAFAH SALIENT?

ANSWER: WE HAVE SAID THAT A FUTURE SOLUTION TO THEM
HAS TO BE FOUND IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. WE HAVE TALKED IN
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 20 STATE 083012

TERMS OF WHETHER THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO ISRAELI
DEFENSE FORCES PROTECTING THE SETTLEMENTS. WE ARE NOT
SAYING THAT SADAT WILL ACCEPT THE SETTLEMENTS THERE IF
THEY ARE UNDER UN OR EGYPTIAN PROTECTION. ALL WE ARE
SAYING IS THAT IF THE ELEMENT OF ISRAELI DEFENSE FORCES
THERE PROTECTING THEM WERE REMOVED, THIS MIGHT OPEN
POSSIBILITIES NOT THERE NOW. THE ISRAELI POSITION AS I
UNDERSTAND IT IS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD REMAIN
AND THEY SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY ISRAELI SECURITY FORCES
IN SOME WAY. WE ARE ASKING THE QUESTION ABOUT ALTERNATIVE
MEANS OF PROTECTION--I DON'T KNOW IF IT WOULD
OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES.

QUESTION: SO YOU ARE SAYING SECRETARY VANCE'S STATEMENT
THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT EXIST DID NOT MEAN THAT

ISRAEL SHOULD NECESSARILY DISMANTLE THEM?

ANSWER: THAT'S RIGHT. WHAT THAT FORMULATION REALLY
MEANT WAS THAT THESE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN
ESTABLISHED.

QUESTION: WHY SHOULD ISRAEL TRUST YOU, TRUST YOUR
SECURITY COMMITMENTS OR GUARANTEES, WHEN IT IS OBVIOUS
THAT YOU ARE NOT KEEPING UP YOUR COMMITMENT TO US ABOUT
THE PLANES? YOU ARE WEDDING THAT COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL
FO 1975 TO OTHER COMMITMENTS TO THE ARABS, AND PUTTING
FORWARD THE PLANES IN A PACKAGE.

ANSWER: GO BACK AND REVIEW THAT COMMITMENT. IT WAS THAT
WE WOULD TAKE STEPS TO ASSURE THE MAINTENANCE OF

ISRAEL'S DEFENSIVE CAPABILITIES THROUGH THE PROVISION OF
ADVANCED WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE F-16. SINCE THEN
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 21 STATE 083012

THERE HAVE BEEN A GREAT MANY THINGS APPROVED--F-15S FOR
EXAMPLE, AND A LOT OF OTHER EQUIPMENT. I THINK WE ARE
MAINTAINING OUR COMMITMENT.

QUESTION: BUT NOW YOU ARE INTRODUCING A NEW ELEMENT;
YOU ARE CONDITIONING THE PLANES ON SOMETHING THAT HAS
NOTHING TO DO WITH US. SO IF WE GET ANOTHER SECURITY
COMMITMENT FROM YOU, A FEW YEARS FROM NOW WE WILL FIND
WE ARE DEPENDENT UPON SOME EXTRANEIOUS CONDITION YOU MAKE.

ANSWER: BUT WE ARE PROPOSING TO SELL YOU THE F-16S.
WE ARE NOT PROPOSING NOT TO SELL THEM. WE SIMPLY THINK
THAT THERE ARE SOME OTHER COMMITMENTS ALSO, INCLUDING
A COMMITMENT THAT WAS MADE ALMOST THAT LONG AGO TO SELL
A MODERN AIRCRAFT TO THE SAUDIS.

QUESTION: BUT WHY THE LINKAGE?

ANSWER: THE ANSWER IS THAT WE FEEL THAT THIS IS NOT IN
VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT OF THE COMMITMENT, THAT WE ARE
PROPOSING TO MAKE THE SALE. WE ALSO THINK THE OTHERS ARE
VERY IMPORTANT FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW.

QUESTION: BUT THIS HAS RAISED QUESTIONS IN ISRAEL
ABOUT THE RELIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES AS A PARTNER
IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: I FIND IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW THERE CAN BE
ANY REAL QUESTION ABOUT OUR COMMITMENT TO THE SECURITY
OF ISRAEL, GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
AND THE VOLUME OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT THAT HAS BEEN
SOLD AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE SOLD. IT SEEMS TO ME THIS

COMMITMENT HAS BEEN SO AMPLY DEMONSTRATED OVER THE YEARS
THAT THERE OUGHT NOT TO BE ANY QUESTION ABOUT IT. I
UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION. WE SIMPLY DO NOT AGREE THAT
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 22 STATE 083012

SELLING THOSE PLANES TO SAUDI ARABIA IS PROBLEM FOR THE
SECURITY OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: BUT WASN'T THE LINKAGE MADE TO MAKE THE SALE
OF THE SAUDI AND EGYPTIAN PLANES MORE PALATABLE TO
CONGRESS?

ANSWER: IT WAS DONE BECAUSE WE THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL OF THESE SALES GO THROUGH FOR THE SAKE OF OUR OWN POLICIES AND OUR OWN INTERESTS IN THE AREA; WE DO NOT THINK IT WILL CHANGE THE BALANCE. I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS WOULD BE KEPT IN PROPORTION, AND NOT SINGLED OUT TO SHOW THAT THE UNITED STATES IS NOT A RELIABLE PARTNER OF ISRAEL.

QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT DAYAN IS COMING?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NO DEFINITE PROPOSAL. OF COURSE, WE WILL BE TALKING OVER THE COMING WEEKS, BUT NOTHING IS DEFINITE YET. UNQUOTE COOPER UNQUOTE COOPER UNQUOTE VANCE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 sep 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: JOURNALISTS, PRESS CONFERENCES, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 31 mar 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978STATE083012
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA/P:GFSHERMAN:MAR
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D780139-0851
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t197803126/baaafcgw.tel
Line Count: 2503
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 2e6f5ebb-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 46
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: N/A
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3167509
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: BACKGROUND BRIEFING TO SEVEN ISRAELI CORRESPONDENTS SECRETARY ACKNOWLEDGE ONLY 1. FOLLOWING IS A CLOSE PARAPHRASE OF A ONE-HOUR BACK- GROUND SESSION WHICH ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON HAD WITH THE SEVEN ISRAELI CORRESPONDENTS BASED IN WASHINGTON.
TAGS: PEPR, SOPN, IS, XF, US, (ATHERTON, ALFRED L JR)
To: TEL AVIV NIACT INFO JERUSALEM MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/2e6f5ebb-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

